

LOVE AS A MOTIVE FOR MISSION
An Approach to the Biblical Theology of Mission

by



FRANCIS ROSS KINSLER



A THESIS PRESENTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH IN THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY

Edinburgh, Scotland

1962

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate Francis Ross Kinsler

Address _____

Degree Doctor of Philosophy

Date November, 1962

Title of Thesis "Love as a Motive for Mission; An Approach to the Biblical Theology of Mission"

This is a study in the biblical theology of mission, the purpose of which is to discover the essential motive-force of mission. The thesis is: "Love is the motive for mission, and the essential nature of mission is found in the biblical concept of love."

Only two sections of the biblical materials are considered. In Part I the mission of Israel is examined as it is set forth in the prophetic materials of the Old Testament, specifically in terms of the topic, love as a motive for mission. It is stated here that mission is central to the message of the prophets and that the concepts, election, covenant, and service, provide the basic structure for a theology of mission.

In Part II the mission of Jesus is examined as it is revealed by a critical analysis of the Synoptic materials, specifically in terms of love as a motive for mission. It is stated here that the central issue of Jesus' ministry, considered from the perspective of the historical Jesus, is the radical demand of God's Rule. Thus Jesus called all men to repentance, faith, and obedience, and thus he gave himself in his mission. It is also suggested here that the traditional interpretations of Jesus' ministry, which are based on the uniqueness of the time and/or his person, are incorrect with regard to the mind of Jesus. His mission was not based on his own uniqueness; it was an expression of obedience to God's will. Thus he gave himself, even in rejection, suffering, and death, not in the hope of future vindication and personal glory but in the self-denial and self-giving with which he challenged others. Because of the resurrection we know that he perfectly fulfilled God's will, and with the early church we acclaim him as the Servant-Messiah, the Son of God. In Jesus' life and ministry, considered from the perspective of the actual ministry but in the light of the resurrection, we find the full meaning of mission, the content for a theology of mission.

In both parts of this study it is evident not only that love is the motive for mission but that the essential nature of mission is found in the concept of love. "Mission" refers to the purpose or will of God, in which men are called to participate. "Love" refers to the inner and total response of the person, which is the essential nature of true obedience to God's will.

The results of this study in the biblical theology of mission are significant for the church's theology of mission, for the church, as the people of God, has inherited Israel's mission, and her mission, as the body of Christ, is based on Jesus' mission. It is evident that the meaning of the church's existence is found in its mission, that its whole life is bound up with the purpose and love of God, and that the essential nature of its mission is self-denial and self-giving, i.e. love.

PREFACE

The work which is presented in this volume is much more than academic. As the content suggests, it is a statement of the meaning and purpose of life. Therefore it cannot but be the concrete expression of the author's life-mission, in which he is dependent not only upon the research of a few months but in a wider and more profound sense upon those who have contributed to him personally.

There is the missionary outreach of the church in the traditional "overseas" sense, where I was born and brought up, and in the newer "ecumenical" sense, where I hope to serve.

There are my father and mother, who have already given themselves for more than thirty years in the mission of the church in Korea.

There is my wife, with whom I am united and committed in mission.

There are my advisors, Professor J. S. Stewart and Rev. R. A. S. Barbour, both of whom hold my personal esteem for their contribution to the ecumenical mission of the church.

And there are those who have assisted in a very practical way: the Committee on Graduate Fellowships of the United Presbyterian Church U.S.A., under whose support this project was undertaken; the staffs of the New College and University libraries, among whom I have camped for the duration of its evolution; my typist and friend, Mrs. H. S. Strandness, who has brought the work to completion.

F.R.K.
Edinburgh
November, 1962

OUTLINE

	Page
Introduction--An Approach to the Biblical Theology of Mission	1
PART I: THE MISSION OF ISRAEL	10
A. Election	18
1. Its Prevalence and Centrality	
2. Its Meaning and Motive	
3. Theological Implications	
B. Covenant	35
1. Its Dominant Place	
2. Its Meaning and Motive	
3. Theological Implications	
C. Service	52
1. Its Importance	
2. Its Nature and Motive	
3. Theological Implications	
Summary	65
PART II: THE MISSION OF JESUS	68
A. The Mission and Message of Jesus (General)	77
1. Jesus and the People	80
a. Characteristics of Jesus' Public Ministry	
b. Jesus' Public Ministry as Challenge	
1.) Preaching	
2.) Teaching	
3.) Healing	
4.) Calling Disciples	
c. The "Messianic Secret"	
2. Jesus and the Disciples	98
a. Characteristics of Discipleship	
b. The Way of Obedience in Jesus' Teachings	
1.) Self-Denial	
2.) Life-Losing	
3.) Humility	
4.) Possessions	
5.) Ethics	
c. The Final Test	

	Page
3. Jesus and the Pharisees	140
a. Characteristics of the Conflict	
b. The Challenge of Jesus	
1.) The Righteous and Sinners	
2.) The Nature of Sin	
3.) The Commandment of Love	
4.) The Relationship between God's Gift and his Demand	
c. The End of the Conflict	
Summary	186
B. The Mission and Message of Jesus (Particular)	192
1. The Opening of the Ministry	197
a. The Baptism	
b. The Temptation	
2. Sayings of Jesus about Himself	212
a. Signs	
b. Titles	
c. Mission	
3. The Final Crisis	234
a. Caesarea Philippi and the Predictions of Suffering	
b. The Last Supper and Gethsemane	
c. The Trial and the Crucifixion	
Summary	258
Conclusion—Love as a Motive for Mission	262
Bibliography of Works Cited	267

(N.B. Biblical citations are taken from the Revised Standard Version unless noted otherwise.)

INTRODUCTION—An Approach to the Biblical Theology of Mission

The title, "Love as a Motive for Mission," indicates the topic of this study, and the sub-title, "An Approach to the Biblical Theology of Mission," indicates its field, methodology, and limitations. The thesis to be proved is: "Love is the motive for mission, and the essential nature of mission is to be found in the biblical concept of love." The following introductory paragraphs will state briefly the purpose for which this topic is pursued, the method by which it will be developed, and a definition of the thesis which is being set forth.

The purpose of this study is to be seen against the background of the vital and widespread contemporary discussion of the mission of the church. Since the great missionary conference at Edinburgh in 1910 there have been profound changes in the shape and understanding of the church's mission. In the period after World War II "foreign missions" have been increasingly incorporated into what is called the "ecumenical mission."¹ Recently at New Delhi the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches were integrated, uniting the world-wide missionary movement and the movement toward Christian unity. The realization that the esse of the church is to be missionary has often been expressed in terms such as "the church is mission" and "the church lives for its mission." The enlarged meeting of the Committee of the International Missionary Council at Willingen in 1952 worked toward a theology of mission.² W. Andersen wrote after this conference:

¹"Ecumenical mission is the church in the whole world releasing its whole life in dynamic mission, with the purpose of entering directly and vitally into an encounter with the world in the name of Jesus Christ." From the statement of the Mohonk Consultation, W. R. Hogg, New Day Dawning (New York: World Horizons, 1957), p. 100.

²The report on "The Theological Basis of the Missionary Obligation" was received but not formally adopted. N. Goodall, ed., Missions under the Cross (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1953), pp. 238-245.

We are moving towards the discovery of a theology of the missionary enterprise. This is the gain that has accrued through the meeting of missions on the one hand and the church and theology on the other. The course followed by the world missionary conferences in the past has made it clear that the meeting of mission with church is destined to reach fulfillment, and that the encounter of the missionary enterprise with theology has reached its climax. The time has come when it is essential to experience, to recognize, and to express the significance of this meeting for missions and for the church, and the nature of the mutual service which missions and theology can and should render to one another.¹

It has become evident that one of the greatest needs of the church today is to realize her missionary nature, and it has also become evident that an important means toward that realization is the setting forth of a theology of mission.

The present world situation accentuates the urgency of this discussion about the church's mission and indicates the direction which a theology of mission should take. In the midst of increasing secularization,² the population explosion, the rising of new peoples, the tension between East and West, and many other factors, "God calls his church to be an organ of his cosmic redemptive purpose. This sovereign call demands the total response of the whole church."³ In our frightfully divided world and even in our shamefully divided churches the particular need is for reconciliation.⁴ The ecumenical

¹W. Andersen, Towards a Theology of Mission (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 11, 12. More recently Andersen has carried the same theme forward in "Further toward a Theology of Mission," The Theology of the Christian Mission, ed. G. H. Anderson (London: SCM Press, 1961), pp. 300-313. It may be noted that the first main section of this volume, which is a collection of essays by different authors, is entirely inadequate for its title, "The Biblical Basis," i.e. for the biblical basis for a theology of mission.

²Some have spoken of this as a "post-Christian" era, and it is widely recognized that we have seen the irrevocable breakup of the Corpus Christianum. The dissolution of the so-called Christian culture or civilization of the past should awaken the church to the fact and urgency of its mission in every environment, in every place and in every aspect of life.

³"Missionary Vocation and Training," Missions under the Cross, p. 208.

⁴F. W. Dillistone, "The Dispensation of the Spirit," Missions under the Cross, p. 87: "The great need which the Spirit is exposing in our day in every area of the world's life is the need for reconciliation." L. Newbigin, One

movement is thus pursuing unity for mission and mission for unity; it calls for the church to realize its nature as a reconciled and a reconciling fellowship. "What the church must aim at is dynamic catholicity. The whole church, corporately and individually, must be concerned about world-wide Christian unity, and, at the same time, be committed to missionary action on a world front."¹

The purpose of the present study is to contribute to this important, urgent discussion, to probe into the biblical understanding of mission, particularly to analyze the basic motive-force of mission. Leaders in the study of the theology of mission have called for more biblical groundwork.² But this does not mean that we should seek to establish set forms for the church—in any case the Bible does not provide such forms. Rather, according to H. Kraemer, "Biblical self-understanding means to seize the dominant intention and grasp the motives, the power and the spirit, by which the church is moved and in which it has its real being."³ This is the purpose underlying the

Body, One Gospel, One World (London: IMC, 1959), pp. 11, 12: "We should undertake the costly but exciting task of finding out what is the pattern for the church's mission in the new day in which God has been pleased to put us. This is not, first, a matter of organization—though questions of organization necessarily arise in their proper place. It is a matter of fundamental theological thinking, of Bible study, and of discerning the signs of the times. Perhaps what we need above all—and only God can give it to us—is a vision, a symbol, a myth—if you like—which will evoke from the ordinary Christian the response which God wants of us in our generation.... It is already present in the thinking and speaking of missionaries and churchmen during the last decade or so. It could be briefly stated as 'The whole church, with one Gospel of reconciliation for the whole world.'"

¹ J. A. Mackay, "The Great Commission and the Church Today," Missions under the Cross, p. 140.

² Andersen, Towards a Theology of Mission, p. 60: "In reality, the missionary enterprise should find its place first and foremost in the development of the program of biblical exegesis; for the material with the interpretation of which the exegete is concerned is the Word of God spoken to, and sent forth into, the world."

³ H. Kraemer, A Theology of the Laity (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958), p. 125.

present study; this is the reason for considering the topic, "Love as a Motive for Mission."

This study is "An Approach to the Biblical Theology of Mission." It seeks to set forth "the biblical theology of mission." Biblical theology is concerned with the scientific exposition of the religious ideas of the biblical materials. These materials have to do with the relationship between God and man; therefore to be scientific here means not only to set forth "objectively" the thoughts expressed in them but also to become "subjectively" concerned with these thoughts.¹ Only in this way can the biblical materials be rightly understood. Biblical theology holds a particular place in the larger field of biblical studies. It utilizes, but does not repeat, the work of linguists, lower and higher criticism, history, and comparative religion. It provides the groundwork for, but does not replace, the work of dogmatics. Finally, biblical theology seeks to set forth the ideas contained in the biblical materials not by imposing an alien system but by revealing their inner structure and unity, not by forming a synthesis of the whole but by considering the individual authors and movements separately.² The present study lies within the field of biblical theology, for it is concerned particularly with the theology of mission set forth in the biblical materials.

¹This concept is set forth by T. F. Torrance in his lectures on "Scientific Method and Theology," which, unfortunately, have not yet been published. He surmounts the futile antithesis between revelation and reason, faith and fact, or theology and history by pointing out that the basic axiom of science is "conformity to the nature of the object." As any object is known by the knower's being reconciled to it, so God is known by being reconciled to him in the full theological sense. Thus to understand God's word, particularly in the Bible, we must submit to him in faith and obedience.

²On the method of biblical theology cf. the introduction to B. Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, vol. I, 3rd revised ed., trans. D. Eaton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882), which is still perhaps the best statement on the subject.

This study is "an approach" to the biblical theology of mission in two senses. First, it is limited in the sense that it is concerned with one particular aspect of mission; it seeks to analyze the motive for mission in the biblical materials. Therefore other aspects, such as the scope and pattern of mission, which are important in themselves and which involve their own problems, need not be dealt with directly. It is important to note at the outset, however, that this study is not concerned with psychological motivation¹ but with the dynamic of mission theologically conceived.² It seeks by this line of inquiry to examine an important element in the biblical theology of mission. The second limitation of this study is that it deals with only the first two levels or segments of the biblical materials, viz. the Old Testament and the Synoptic Gospels. Part I analyzes "The Mission of Israel" as it is revealed in the Old Testament prophets, and Part II deals with "The Mission of Jesus" as it is revealed in the Synoptic materials. A hypothetical Part III: "The Mission of the Church," covering the rest of the New Testament, has been

¹That motive is a basic part of the psychology of the Hebrews and later the Jews is indicated especially by J. Pedersen, Israel; Its Life and Culture, vols. I-II, trans. A. Møller (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), pp. 99-181. That this mentality is found in the use of the Hebrew (and Aramaic) language is evident in F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 659-661. These two aspects are important as background materials, but they will not be dealt with directly in this study.

²Although the term "motive" is generally thought of psychologically and is generally avoided in the theological disciplines for that reason, it is used here as a theological concept, and it is used because it expresses most precisely the area of concern of this study. As we examine the nature of man's participation in God's reconciling purpose for the world, it will become evident that God's will is obeyed by heart response, by inner and total response of the person, by changing the basic orientation of the person from self-centered to other-centered. The term "motive" is used throughout this study in this far-reaching theological sense.

omitted because it could not be handled within a reasonable scope.¹ Nevertheless there is a certain completeness to this outline, for Part I provides the structure and Part II the content for a "biblical"² theology of mission—specifically with regard to the question of motive.

Finally we come to the thesis itself: "Love is the motive for mission, and the essential nature of mission is to be found in the biblical concept of love." In the course of this study the two terms, "mission" and "love," will be defined in relation to each other. Mission has to do with purpose; it is the purpose or will of God, which men are called to obey. Love has to do with motive; it is the inner and total response of the person. These two concepts have been studied frequently and in various ways,³ but they are best understood

¹It may be suggested at this point that it is these materials which best reveal a theology of mission, particularly with regard to love as the motive. Paul speaks of love as the basic element of the church's life (1 Cor. 13), as the motive for mission (2 Cor. 5:14); the Johannine materials dwell on love as the essence of God's relationship to the world (Jn. 3:16) and of the church's life (1 Jn. 4:7-21); in Acts the picture of the early church and its universal expansion may be described in terms of sacrificial love. It is evident that these and other New Testament materials contain or imply a profound theology of mission. But it is also evident that they would require a work far more extensive than the present one, or else several works.

²Biblical theology, as we have noted, analyzes the theology set forth in the biblical materials; it is the scientific representation of that theology according to its own content and form within the several divisions and even within the various books of the Bible. The term is frequently, though wrongly, used to refer to any theology which purports to be constructed on the basis of the Bible, but every theology claims, or at least should claim, to do that; this is the field of dogmatics. Nevertheless the proper function of biblical theology is to provide the basis for theological construction so that theology may be "biblical" in this sense. Thus in the present study when we refer to the application of the results of this study in biblical theology to theology we shall speak of "biblical" theology as distinct from biblical theology.

³Works on mission are too numerous and varied to cite here. Some important works on love are: J. Moffatt, Love in the New Testament (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929); G. Quell and E. Stauffer, Love, trans. from TWNT by J. R. Coates (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958); A. Nygren, Agape and Eros, trans. P. S. Watson (London: SPCK, 1953); V. Warnack, Agape: Die Liebe als Grundmotiv

when they are brought together.¹ Thus the thesis to be proved here is that love is the motive for mission. In examining this thesis, however, we find that what is involved is nothing less than a theological exposition of the whole concept of mission. Thus the thesis states further that the essential nature of mission is to be found in the biblical concept of love.

Although this thesis has not previously been developed in a systematic, biblical exposition, references to this topic are not wanting.² T. F. Torrance has written, "The interpenetration of being and mission constitutes the nature of the church, so that the church is church as it participates in the active operation of the divine love."³ H. H. Rowley concludes his study of the mission of Israel with these words: "We do not merely proclaim the love of God in Christ objectively; we enter into that love, and know its eager yearning of spirit, and feel the pangs of God's rejected love.... It becomes a part of our very life, laying upon us its imperious constraint, and filling our heart with

der neutestamentlichen Theologie (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1951); J. McIntyre, On the Love of God (London: Collins, 1962); C. Spicq, Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament: analyse des Textes, 3 vols. (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958, 1959).

¹The great missionary apostle, speaking of our participation in God's work of reconciling the world to himself, says, "The love of Christ constraineth us." (2 Cor. 5:14, KJV) Apart from this significant passage, however, there are few explicit references in the Bible to love for those outside the people of God. This is probably why love has not always been directly related to mission, particularly in biblical studies. Love is usually expounded in terms of the relationship of Christians to each other and to God in Christ. Mission is usually seen in terms of the church's relationship to the world. The present study seeks to bring together these two important concepts.

²There is a thesis by J. Van Den Berg under the title, Constrained by Jesus' Love (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1956), but this is "An Inquiry into the Motives of the Missionary Awakening in Great Britain in the Period between 1698 and 1815."

³T. F. Torrance, Royal Priesthood (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1955), p. 30.

an eager passion that fails not."¹ In connection with Jn. 17:26 P. S. Minear has written, "Wherever God's love animates the ministry of Christ's people, there Christ himself is at work. The love of God incarnate in Christ and embodied in Christ's community--this love is the way God has chosen to make his name known to all men."² These insights all point to the proposition that love is the motive for mission and that the essential nature of mission is to be found in the biblical concept of love.

As we have noted already, the following study contains two parts. In Part I "The Mission of Israel" will be examined as it is set forth in the prophetic materials of the Old Testament, for these materials are the predominant factor in the Old Testament as a whole and they reveal a comprehensive theology of mission. Because mission is so central and so general in these materials and because the relevant concepts have previously been set forth extensively, this section will be rather brief. According to the message of the prophets, the entire life of Israel is involved in her calling to be the people of God and to do his will, and the essential nature of her obedient service lies in the concept of love. The prophetic materials provide the basic structure for a "biblical" theology of mission, in which the fact, extent, and dynamic of love as a motive for mission is revealed. In Part II "The Mission of Jesus" will be examined as it is set forth in the Synoptic materials. Because of the critical problem raised by the dual nature of these materials, i.e. because they represent not only the perspective of Jesus'

¹H. H. Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament (London: Carey Press, 1944), p. 82.

²P. S. Minear, Jesus and his People (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957), p. 28.

ministry but also the perspective of the early church after the resurrection, and because of the need for a reexamination of the life of Jesus, specifically in terms of his mission, this section will take up the major part of the study. The materials from Jesus' ministry, as they are examined here, reveal that Jesus' understanding of obedience was essentially a matter of self-denial and self-giving; they reveal that his life was wholly given in response to God's Rule, in obedience to God's will. Thus the ministry of Jesus provides the basic content for a "biblical" theology of mission, in which the full meaning and expression of love as a motive for mission are revealed.

PART I: THE MISSION OF ISRAEL

Part I provides the historical background for the mission of the church. In the Old Testament we find not only that Israel is the predecessor of the church as God's people but also that a theology of mission is already emerging. The task will be to define this mission and the extent to which love is involved by taking a cross-section of the crucial Old Testament materials. This study will contribute the framework for a "biblical" theology of mission. A further statement of the method of Old Testament theology will be given first.

Old Testament theology goes beyond the phenomenology of Israel's history and the Religionsgeschichte of her faith; it studies the Old Testament as "the literary deposit of the action of God"¹ in the history of the people of Israel. It approaches these writings by accepting their position of faith, the New Testament as the culmination of that faith, and the Christian church as the heir to its revelation. The Bible is a unity: "The unity is not the unity of the spirit of Israel and of the Church, but the unity of the Divine revelation given in the context of history and through the medium of human personality."² In this revelation God makes himself known to his people and through them to the world.³ With this presupposition the Old Testament theologian grasps the nature of his material, the unity running throughout the Bible, and the ultimate reference point in Jesus Christ. He then analyses

¹E.C. Blackman, "The Task of Exegesis," The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), p. 19: "The Bible is not itself revelation but is the record of revelation, that revelation being understood as a series of divine interventions for man's benefit, the 'saving acts' of God."

²H.H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (London: Carey Press, 1953), p. 16.

³T.C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, trans. S. Neujiën (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 17.

and brings together the meaning of the message of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament itself is the field of study.¹ The message of the Old Testament has been described as "the confessional recital of the redemptive acts of God in a particular history."² This message running through the Old Testament is a history with a meaning; it is God's dealings with Israel. Therefore the task of Old Testament theology is to understand the meaning of this history as set forth by the writers themselves. It has often been pointed out that the Old Testament does not contain abstract theology; nevertheless it does set forth its own theological interpretation of history in terms of God's saving acts and Israel's decisive role. The Old Testament theologian should revise his understanding of theology to deal fairly with the materials, but he may also give theological explication to non-theological materials.³

In his analysis and synthesis of the message of the Old Testament, the theologian derives both content and form from his object.⁴ "What is important for theology is to arrive at a supramundane meaning in history, its goal, what God intended and did with history."⁵ The task of Old Testament theology is

¹Ibid., p. 121: "Old Testament theology is a form of scholarship differing from the history of Israel's religion in its object as well as in its method. In its object because its object is not the religion of Israel but the Old Testament; in its method because it is a study of the message of the Old Testament both in itself and in its relation to the New Testament."

²G. E. Wright, God Who Acts; Biblical Theology as Recital (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 13.

³G. Ebeling, "The Meaning of 'Biblical Theology,'" Journal of Theological Studies, vi (1955), p. 223.

⁴A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904), p. 1: "In biblical theology the Bible is the source of the knowledge, and also supplies the form in which the knowledge is presented."

⁵S. Mowinkel, The Old Testament as Word of God, trans. R. B. Bjornard (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1960), p. 47.

"to define the characteristic features of the message of the Old Testament."¹ A general pattern may be discerned in the Heilsgeschichte; "this is not a dogmatic scheme imposed upon the Bible, but a central core of the biblical testimony itself."² The task is to take "a cross-section of the realm of Old Testament thought," determine what is essential and expose "the total structure of the system and the basic principles on which it rests."³

The purpose of Part I is to present the background of the mission of the church as it is found in the theological framework of the mission of Israel. It utilizes the findings of Old Testament theology in describing the purpose and love by which God's people were to carry out their mission.⁴ It does not recount the historical events themselves, though obviously these are essential to the total picture, but analyses the interpretative side in so far as the topic is concerned. Since the concepts involved in this study are so familiar, they can be set forth generally and briefly. The centrality of these concepts indicates the importance of this study.

Because we are concerned with the Old Testament interpretation of Israel's

¹Vriezen, op. cit., p. 122.

²Blackman, op. cit., p. 19.

³W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, vol. I, trans. J. A. Baker (London: SCM Press, 1961), p. 27.

⁴The following works in Old Testament theology set forth the major ideas of this section: H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1950); M. H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (London: Epworth Press, 1944); E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. A.W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958); Vriezen, op. cit. What has remained for the present study is to set forth these ideas and the materials upon which they are based according to their inner logic and therewith to provide a pattern or structure for a "biblical" theology of mission.

role in history, we will direct our attention to the prophetic materials. The prophetic movement really began with Moses, but its height was from 750 to 500 B.C. Because of the catastrophic events of the latter period, the words of the prophets finally triumphed. The Torah and the Nebiim Rishonim as well as the Major and Minor Prophets were dominated by the prophetic movement. It is therefore the foundation of the entire Old Testament.¹

The importance of the prophetic viewpoint for this topic cannot be overstressed, because "they saw the true role which Israel was meant to play."² Their message was concerned "with the creation of a divinely ruled society--one which acknowledged and obeyed the revealed will of its Lord."³ The prophets proclaimed the will of Yahweh, which defined Israel's mission; they proclaimed Yahweh's love and mercy, which defined her motivation.

As a prophetic testimony the Old Testament is the authentic record of the history of salvation that God gave to Israel; it makes it possible as it were, to look into the documents that deal with the work of God in Israel, his concern with man, his deeds in history and his revelation to the prophets through the Word; in the struggle between the prophets and the people it illustrates how he was engaged in bringing his people to the place that he had chosen, by his work, word, and Spirit; thus it reveals God's loyalty and majesty, his love and justice, his holiness and his desire for man's salvation. In a word, it shows God making his way through Israel to the whole world of mankind.⁴

¹Vriezen, op. cit., pp. 39ff; W. J. Phythian-Adams, The Call of Israel (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 22: "They were its mainspring, its creative impulse: their inspiration was the breath which gave it life; which knit together the ancient legends of the Patriarchs, the triumph and solemnity of the Exodus, the struggles of the growing Nation, its glories and its tragedy, into one coherent Form, and revealed Israel to the hearts of the Faithful as the Chosen Servant, the foreordained Ambassador of God."

²G. E. Wright, The Challenge of Israel's Faith (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), p. 63.

³Ibid., p. 68.

⁴Vriezen, op. cit., p. 91.

The Old Testament interpretation of God's saving acts is often analysed in terms of God and Israel, God and history, God and the world, God and nature. This is a movement from God downwards and then upwards. In the present cross-section the pattern which emerges in connection with Israel's mission and which seems to be central to the prophetic materials is a movement from God through Israel to the world. Though not expressed fully from the beginning, there is an organic development of this understanding through three of the most important concepts of the Old Testament: election, covenant, and service. These three are inherently related, and together they define Israel's mission, the purpose underlying her whole existence as the people of God. Each of these concepts is essential to the prophetic interpretation of Israel's mission, although the modern tendency is to consider the last of these as more important or more relevant. In each of these phases¹ love is the basic dynamic force essential to the carrying out of this mission.

This three-fold movement from God through Israel to the world does not lessen the importance of the existential relationship between God and his people. Rather it sees the whole life of Israel as being caught up in the one movement of God in his loving purpose for the world, his giving himself in revelation and redemption.² This was already implied in Israel's election, when she was delivered from bondage in Egypt. It became possible in the

¹It is absolutely essential to note here that the term "phase" is used throughout Part I in a purely logical, non-temporal sense. It must be emphasized--as the succeeding discussion seeks to do--that the three concepts are a unity and that the logic of their integration is essential to the understanding of mission.

²Mowinkel, *op. cit.*, p. 45: "The revelation of God is God's own self-giving activity and the religious-moral life and the religious-moral insight that is created by it. It unfolds itself through history in the widest sense of this term; that which actually happens. History in both the cosmic and the earthly sense is the great drama played for the salvation of the world; it is in this drama that God 'makes himself known.'"

covenant relationship, which was established at Sinai. And its fulfillment was clearly described in the Servant passages of Deutero-Isaiah.

It has already been stated that the peak of the prophetic movement and its interpretation of Israel's history came in 750-500 B.C. It should also be mentioned that the roots of the prophetic faith, as the prophets themselves continually affirmed,¹ lay in the deliverance and exodus, when Israel was created as God's people. Of central importance in the overall history of Israel's faith are the work of Moses and the events of his period.² Also important, as recent scholarship has pointed out, is the even more remote age of the patriarchs.³ Israel's God had been working throughout her past; he made his greatest deliverance in the days of Moses; and he gave the clearest revelation of Israel's mission through the great prophets.

The following study defines Israel's mission and motive as the people of God in terms of the three basic theological concepts of the prophetic interpretation, election, covenant, and service. The tendency in biblical theology has been to emphasize the lexicographical method and to overweight

¹Vriezen, op. cit., p. 70: "The prophetic message is entirely focused on the miraculous deliverance from Egypt and the desert."

²H. H. Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament (London: Carey Press, 1944); The Biblical Doctrine of Election; The Unity of the Bible, p. 112: "At the time of the Exodus, in the deliverance from Egypt and in all that preceded and followed it, there was given a revelation of God, and there lay the foundation of Old Testament religion as it was established by Moses." Cf. J. Bright, A History of Israel (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 132: "The evidence obliges us to trace /Israel's faith/ in all its major lines back to the desert and to Moses—who stands, as the Bible depicts him, as the great founder of Israel."

³Cf. W. F. Albright, The Biblical Period (Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania), pp. 3-6. See further Albright's From the Stone Age to Christianity (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1957).

particular words with theological content.¹ The method used here is to trace the double strand, mission and love, in terms of several related words and larger syntactical units and also in terms of the literary figures and the theology of the writers.

Finally, it must be remembered that the prophets presented their call to Israel as the word of God; they did not derive their ideas by looking at the achievements of the people. They were themselves the ones who came closest to fulfilling the will of Yahweh even as they tried to persuade their people. They were eventually forced to look for a future fulfillment because their message was always rejected.

¹J. Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).

A. ELECTION

The understanding of the mission of Israel as it is presented by the Old Testament prophets can begin at no other point than election. Not only is election "one of the central realities of the Old Testament"; it is also "the initial act by which Yahweh comes into relation with his people and the permanent reality which assures the constancy of that bond."¹ It is historically and theologically the foundation of Israel's existence as the people of God. Historically it describes the beginning of Israel as a people, primarily in terms of her miraculous deliverance from Egypt. Theologically it affirms that God himself created Israel for his own purpose out of his own love. This concept of election, therefore, is the first essential phase of the prophetic interpretation of Israel's mission.

A survey of the strands of the Pentateuch and the books of the prophets reveals the prevalence and centrality of the theme of election.² In the Urgeschichte of Gen. 2-11, whose author is spiritually related to J and a disciple of the great prophets, election "dominates the narrative," although it is not explicitly stated. J is founded on Israel's calling as the people of God. Stretching from Gen. 12 to Judg. 2, it describes Israel's election in terms of the call to the patriarchs, the deliverance from Egypt, and the development of the nation that received the promised land. "Thus the dominating idea of J's teaching proves to be Israel's call to be the people of God, and the fulfillment of this call by the wonderful

¹ E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. A.W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958), p. 201.

² This survey is based on T. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, trans. S. Neujiyen (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 39-78.

grace of God alone, who gave this people his promise and himself fulfilled this promise."¹ E, the first enlarged edition of J, stresses the separation of Israel in her vocation. It concentrates, perhaps dangerously, on the people and her leaders as elect. D, a re-editing of Gen. 2 to 2 Kings 25, also centers in Israel's calling as the chosen people of God and calls the people back to obedience. Although it had been previously presupposed, in Deuteronomy the idea of election is for the first time clearly associated with the people; it becomes the basis for their cultic and social life. "In a peculiar manner Deuteronomy accentuates both Israel's calling and its election; because Israel is the chosen people it is called to realize theocracy. Election must find expression in the knowledge of responsibility, otherwise it brings judgment."² Finally, P is also concerned with Israel as the people of God. The priestly writers of the return were concerned primarily with the re-establishment of the temple and the cult, e.g. the liturgical manuals in Leviticus and Numbers. But they also worked out a systematic, theological conception of history, with creation and three covenants as the main points of history and genealogical registers as links. Their God is universal, yet has a peculiar relationship with Israel. Therefore election is basic here, too, but it is seen in terms of man's meeting God's standards, especially in the cult but also in the moral and religious life. All the writings of the Torah, which represent at least 400 years and widely varying viewpoints, agree that election is essential to Israel's life.

In the books of the Major and Minor Prophets there is an even greater

¹ Ibid., p. 46. Cf. J. Bright, A History of Israel (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 133.

² Vriezen, op. cit., p. 48.

prevalence and centrality of election. These men were the spokesmen for God during the catastrophic events around 722, 586, and 539 B.C. It was their interpretation of Israel's role in history which came through these crises and dominated the Torah and remains in their own words. The calamity of Israel's situation and the urgency of God's word forced them to reiterate continually the essentials of Israel's existence as the people of God, and the first essential, upon which Israel's survival and service depended, was election. Therefore they referred back endlessly to God's great deeds in making her his people, delivering her from bondage and from her enemies, forbearing her continual rebellion, warning of the judgment and disaster of her ways, ever calling her back to his purpose and love. The teaching of the prophets, therefore, "links up as do the links of a chain,"¹ passing on the proclamation of God's word to Israel. And for them election was not only the foundation of Israel's mission but also the basis for their own ministry.

In this survey of the Torah and the Nebiim it is clear that election is the first basic phase of Israel's mission. The next step is to consider several important passages which bring out the meaning of this election and its motivation.

The prophets are united in their constant reference to the enactment of election in Israel's past history.² There are, however, two major eras to which they point: 1. the patriarchs, especially Abraham; 2. the exodus,

¹ Ibid., p. 54.

² W. J. Phythian-Adams, The Call of Israel (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 23: "The prophets were one and all convinced and fervent believers in the Call of Israel"; p. 24: "Down through the centuries these voices swell and unite into one single heart-stirring cry, 'Remember!'"

under Moses. The former is represented by Gen. 12:1-3 (with possible parallels in Amos 3:2 and Jer. 4:2):

Now the Lord said to Abram, "Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you. And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and him who curses you I will curse; and by you all the families of the earth will bless themselves."

Abraham was called out and was promised a great inheritance which would be a source of blessing to the whole earth. This election was actually fulfilled in the days of Moses, who more than any other man was the founder of the Israelite people.¹ His calling was to lead the people out of Egypt and establish them as the people of God:

"Come, I will send you to Pharaoh that you may bring forth my people, the sons of Israel, out of Egypt."²

The extent to which the references to the patriarchs are a projection of Israel's history backward is debatable. Nevertheless, the importance here lies in the prophetic belief in God's creation of a people to be called by his name.³ Although Yahweh was the God of their fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the prophets dwelt primarily upon the deliverance in the days of Moses. In any case--in his dealings with both Abraham and Moses--God

¹H. H. Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament (London, Carey Press, 1944), p. 27: "In him were the foundations laid, and not least the foundations of the missionary message of Israel, and the missionary activity of the Christian Church."

²Ex. 3:10.

³H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1950), p. 31: "the election in Abraham and the election through Moses." Jacob, op. cit., pp. 205, 206: "With Abraham, Yahweh declares the existence of the people.... For Moses on the other hand, what matters is the accomplishment of a work for which the existence of the people was indispensable."

was miraculously creating a people which was no people to be his chosen people.

The great prophets at the decline and fall of the Northern Kingdom proclaimed the election of Israel; in the light of election they exposed her sins—cultic, political, and social—and sought repentance. The message of Amos was one of impending judgment. He proclaimed God's mighty acts in Israel's past (Amos 2:9-11); he saw the evil of Israel's present sins; and he expected the judgment of their righteous God to be more severe toward them than upon the nations.¹ The keynote of his message is sounded in Amos 3:1, 2:

Hear this word that the Lord has spoken against you, O people of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up out of the land of Egypt: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities."

It is clear that election was the basis of Israel's life and that, because of her election, Israel lived to fulfill the purpose of God. In her sins, primarily those of social injustice, she disobeyed God's purpose and faced destruction. Even the cultic worship was useless (Amos 5:21-23). God's purpose in Israel's election must be fulfilled in justice (v. 24).

The meaning of election and its underlying motivation are developed further by the prophet Hosea. "To Amos God is righteous, and conduct is the nation's supreme concern; to Hosea God is love, and everything depends on Israel's relation to him."² Hosea's contribution to the interpretation of Israel's mission as the people of God is that he gave the first and greatest expression of love as the motivation for this mission—primarily God's unfailing love for Israel, calling her to be his people and continuing

¹Phythian-Adams, op. cit., p. 24.

²A. S. Peake, The Religion of Israel (London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1908), p. 64.

to woo her in spite of her sinful harlotry, but also the love which Israel was ideally to return to God.¹ This insight of Hosea was gained in his own experience as the husband of an unfaithful wife and was expressed most vividly in two metaphors: 1. Yahweh as Israel's loving father; 2. Yahweh as Israel's persevering husband. In these metaphors, which are found frequently in the prophets, election is the foundation of Israel's life, and love is the motive.

"When Israel was a child, I loved him,
and out of Egypt I called my son.
The more I called them,
the more they went from me;
they kept sacrificing to the Baals,
and burning incense to idols.

Yet it was I who taught Ephraim to walk,
I took them up in my arms;
but they did not know that I healed them.
I led them with cords of compassion,
with the bands of love,
and I became to them as one
who eases the yoke on their jaws,
and I bent down to them and fed them."²

Election is seen in the deliverance from Egypt (Hos. 13:4-5), and love ('ahabah) is God's motive in calling Israel.³ Israel was turning from his father, his creator and provider, upon whose loving care he was dependent.

An even more tragic expression of God's love and Israel's sin is found in the metaphor of marriage. God called Israel and lavished his love upon

¹G. Quell and E. Stauffer, Love, trans. from TWNT by J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958). p. 17: "Hosea is the first, so far as we know, to have realised and set forth love as the fundamental motive in Yahweh's treatment of his people.... Hosea clearly recognises the flowing forth of divine love at the heart of the election of Israel and the Covenant."

²Hos. 11:1-4.

³Phythian-Adams, op. cit., pp. 25, 26: "This is the refrain which runs throughout his prophecies, the thought which for Hosea enfolds past, present, and future."

her in her innocence in the wilderness. What he sought from her was not her goodness or her sacrifices (Hos. 6:6) but love. Although she has turned away in unfaithfulness, God will not forsake her. The keynote of Hosea's message is one of tender pleading (Hos. 11:8): "How can I give up, O Ephraim!" God will call Israel back to the wilderness (Hos. 2:14-15), and betroth her anew (vv. 16-20).

The prophets of the period of Judah's fall continued the witness to Israel's election as they sought to interpret Israel's mission as the people of God. They, too, saw that God's will was to be reflected in Israel's life, his love by her faithfulness. But they faced the same rebellious sin and the approaching disaster of their people.

The book of Deuteronomy lies within the prophetic movement of this period. It is especially significant for the topic because of its nature and its message. It was composed as a speech of Moses to the people and was meant to interpret the law to the lay community. Coming as it does in this crucial period, it does not set forth new laws but sets forth a homiletic, authoritative understanding of the will of God for his people.¹ Its message is founded on election, and it stresses the themes of the bondage in Egypt, the great redemption, the Covenant at Horeb, and the gift of the land. Again, its purpose is not to present new truths, but to proclaim the mighty acts of God as the guarantees of his election and of his power to bless or to curse.²

¹G. von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, trans. D. Stalker (London: SCM Press, 1953), pp. 11-23.

²Phythian-Adams, op. cit., pp. 30-32.

Deuteronomy also explores the reason or motivation for God's election of Israel. The reason is not found in any virtue or greatness found in Israel; these are explicitly denied (Deut. 9:4, 5, 7:7, 8). The reason must be found on God's side. It is because of his promise to their fathers-- but this is only to push the problem further back. The real explanation of God's call to Israel is found in his love.

"For you are a people holy to the Lord your God; the Lord your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth. It was not because you were more in number than any other people that the Lord set his love upon you and chose you, for you were the fewest of all peoples; but it is because the Lord loves you...."¹

And not only is God motivated by love in his election of Israel; they also are to love him in return as his people.² It is love which underlies the commandments and the fulfillment of God's will.

"Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might. And these words which I command you this day shall be upon your heart."³

In election God creates Israel to be his own people out of love, and in election, also, Israel is called upon to yield him her love completely in carrying out his purpose. By this time--at least--election means that God's purpose and love are the source of Israel's mission, her purpose and motive. By this time, also, monotheism is explicit, and this has important implications for Israel's mission.

¹ Deut. 7:6-8.

² Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 48: "To the Deuteronomist, the love of God as manifested in his choice of Israel laid upon Israel the sacred obligation to respond to that love by love, and to express her love in obedience."

³ Deut. 6:4-6.

The message of Jeremiah, like that of his predecessors, is based on election. Although they, too, were called to proclaim the word of God, Jeremiah gives the greatest insight into his own struggle as God's chosen instrument.

Now the word of the Lord came to me saying, "Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations."¹

But whereas in his own experience Jeremiah felt compelled to obey God as his prophet, his great burden was that Israel did not obey God as his people. The reform of Josiah was soon lost as the people returned to their sins. Even the threat of Babylon did not shake them out of their false security. To them God's presence in Jerusalem and his election of Israel ensured their safety; to Jeremiah the very fact that they presumed upon their election ensured their destruction.

Jeremiah saw in election Israel's call to serve God by her life, and he saw that her service must come from the heart. God searches the heart and finds it deceitful and corrupt (Jer. 17:9, 10). Judah saw her sister Israel play the harlot and God divorce her. Yet Judah did not return to her Lord; she, too, played the harlot. Though Jeremiah's call for repentance went unheeded and destruction was inevitable, God pointed beyond. He would give a new heart to a remnant (Jer. 24:7, 32:39); he would establish a new covenant in their hearts (Jer. 31:31-34, 32:40, 41). And in this new age the will of God would be reflected in the life of his people as God's love is reflected in their love—with the whole heart. In Jeremiah this goes beyond the national level to the individual.²

¹Jer. 1:4, 5.

²Peake, op. cit., p. 102.

The destruction of Jerusalem and the exile brought the greatest challenge to Israel's faith. In this experience the teaching of the prophets was the chain which carried Israel on toward the fulfillment of her mission. In Deutero-Isaiah we find another great link which continues the tradition and brings it to its highest expression. It prepares the people for the return by proclaiming Israel's mission as the Servant of Yahweh. Here again election is the foundation of Israel's existence as the people of God and her survival among the nations.

But you, Israel, my servant,
 Jacob, whom I have chosen,
 the offspring of Abraham, my friend;
 You whom I took from the ends of the earth,
 and called from its farthest corners,
 saying to you, "You are my servant,
 I have chosen you and not cast you off";
 fear not, for I am with you,
 be not dismayed, for I am your God;
 I will strengthen you, I will help you,
 I will uphold you with my victorious right hand.¹

In these writings which are so important for the prophetic interpretation of Israel's mission election is primary and foundational. Israel is chosen to be God's servant; because she is chosen she lives to fulfill the purpose of God. God is the sovereign creator of the earth and Lord over the

¹Is. 41:8-10. Jacob, *op. cit.*, p. 208: "The exile was needed to set free all the potentialities that were implicit in the idea of election. For the first time, no doubt, the election itself was called in question. That Yahweh had forsaken his people (Is. 40:27, 42:18, 49:14) must have been the state of mind of the majority of the exiles. To restore the certainty of divine election to the people was the message of Second Isaiah. The election stands, for Israel is always the servant of Yahweh, that is to say, the object of a privilege that a restoration more wonderful than past times will show, but this privilege is accompanied by an obligation and it is this second aspect that the prophet brings to complete expression. Since the light of Yahweh is risen upon it, Israel in its turn must be a light to the nations and must not be content to let the nations come to itself."

nations; Israel is to be his humble, obedient servant among the nations. God has redeemed Israel that she might render to him her life in service. And once again love is the motive (Is. 43:4, 48:14). The extent to which this lofty picture of Israel's service was rejected by the people and then projected onto a future individual is debatable. What is important for the present is that the message of Deutero-Isaiah brings the prophetic "theology of mission" to its highest point and that its foundation is election.

The final step in this consideration of election is to present its theological implications. Here is the meaning of election¹ as the first phase of an Old Testament theology of mission based on the prophetic materials. The two basic aspects are those of the double strand of the topic.

First, election must be viewed in terms of purpose, teleologically. It means that God has a purpose for Israel and that she exists to fulfill that purpose. God created Israel when she was no people, fulfilling a promise to Abraham their father; he delivered Israel when she was in hopeless bondage in Egypt; he defeated her enemies and gave her a land and defended her; he resurrected her when she was destroyed and exiled. In Israel's origin and throughout her history it was God's election which gave her life. Therefore she owed him the service of her life; she lived to fulfill his will.

Even by the fact of her being the passive object of God's choice Israel

¹The lexicographical roots of election include not only the words for to choose (יָרָא), to call (קָרָא), and to know (יָדָע) but also various related concepts. The theological roots of election lie not only in the meaning of these words but in the whole Israelite historiography and in the whole of prophetic thought—their faith, teachings, figures, and actions—and in the whole life of the people as far as it was a reflection of their historiography and the prophetic message.

served his purpose. The fact that she was no people made her a suitable instrument for God's service, a fitting object of his election. Even in this way she was God's witness to the nations.¹

But God called Israel in order to reveal himself to her. By his choice he committed himself to her and gave her his name. She was to be his people, and he was to be her God. Her service, therefore, was to be based on her response to him; it was to receive his revelation of himself by yielding herself to him. God chose Israel so that she would choose him. His sovereign choice must therefore be reflected in the humble allegiance of his people, her worship, her trust and obedience. Just as God's purpose was carried out in his self-revelation to Israel, Israel's mission must be to give herself completely to him. Here lies the significance of the first commandment (Ex. 20:3), and here lies the seriousness of Israel's idolatry. Here lies the apostasy of interpreting election as security and self-righteousness rather than dependence and gratitude. Israel's allegiance was to be a witness to the nations; to the extent that she turned from Yahweh she rejected the ground of her existence.

When God called Israel to be his people, he chose to reveal his will to her. Therefore Israel's service was to be a conscious service, a response to his will. His purpose was to become her purpose, his will her will. At this point lies further possibility for rebellion, for not carrying out God's will, and Israel's history, even during the first years in the wilderness, is astonishingly full of rebellion. Here lies the apostasy of interpreting election

¹Howley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 42.

as privilege rather than vocation.¹ But in refusing to give willing service, Israel renounced her election as God's people and deserved destruction. Therefore, both in willing service and in punished disobedience she was a witness to the nations.

God's will for his people was that she would reflect his nature; his nature determined her response to him, her obedience to his will.² Here lies the whole ethical system as it developed from the days of Moses, and here lay much of Israel's disobedience. Israel was to live as God's people, carrying out his will by being a living witness to him.

Finally, it was revealed to Israel that though Yahweh was the God of Israel, he was also the God of the nations, the God of creation, the one God of heaven and earth. It was implicit in God's call to Moses that he could make himself lord over other nations, even if monotheism was then only in its nascent stages.³ And it was explicit from the time of Moses that

¹Ibid., p. 45: "Election is for service. This is not to ignore the fact that it carries with it privilege. For in the service of God is man's supreme privilege and honour. Yet, as will appear, the measure of the privilege varies widely according to the glory of the service. Some are chosen for involuntary service, and there is little honour or privilege for them. In its highest form, however--election to be the recipient of the divine revelation and the medium of revelation to others--so great a privilege is involved that all who are granted it must be filled with humble wonder in the moment of their realization of its greatness. To those who willingly and consciously accept the task to which they are called, the resources of God are open for the fulfilment of their mission, and here again is high privilege. Yet it is never primarily for the privilege but for the service that the elect are chosen."

²Ibid., p. 39: "The uniqueness of his choice of Israel was the uniqueness of the degree in which he chose to reveal his character and his will through her."

³Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, pp. 26, 27; J. Bright, op. cit., pp. 139, 140.

Yahweh was not tied to Israel by blood or land but by choice. In her subsequent history and in the teaching of the prophets it became clear that Yahweh was the sovereign lord of all nations. He ruled the nations, but his self-revelation was through Israel by his election of her to be his people. His use of others, such as Balaam and Cyrus, was a different kind of election, because it was not election for willing service; even his use of Assyria and Babylon to destroy Israel and Judah did not change this. These examples merely confirm that Yahweh is God over all the nations and that his conscious purpose is to be fulfilled in the mission of Israel. But this further indicates the scope of Israel's mission—to the nations.

The other aspect of election, besides purpose, is its motivation. This dynamic aspect runs parallel to the teleological and is integral to it. When God created Israel from nothing to be his people, he was motivated by love.¹ There was no virtue or greatness, which gave her any priority over the peoples

¹According to N.H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1944), pp. 131-142, the root אָהַב is the key to understanding election and is to be translated "election-love." In his analysis, "we can lay down three main elements for the understanding of the Hebrew 'ahabah' (love). First, God's love for Israel is an unconditioned, sovereign love. Second, Israel's love for God is a conditioned, dutiful love, showing itself in the proper fulfilment of God's requirements as laid down in the Covenant. Third, Israel must obey, not only because he must, but also because he must 'love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his will (nephesh, desire, self), and with all his strength.'" God's love is manifested in the Old Testament not only in election (אָהַב), but also in covenant (בְּרִית), which will be considered in Section B. "The love which chose Israel in the first place is also the love which preserved the Israel that had been chosen. God's chesed for chosen Israel is also His 'ahabah' through which he chose Israel. Chesed is God's love as Israel experienced it, whilst 'ahabah' is God's love which first enabled Israel to experience it."

RACERASE BOND

SOUTHWORTH CO.

U.S.A.

of the earth.¹ On the contrary the lack of these point to the spontaneity of God's love, his gracious action on her behalf.

When God called Israel, his self-revelation to her was motivated by love; in it he gave himself to her to be her God. Therefore she was to be his people by receiving his love and returning that love.² Love was the motive of God's commitment to Israel and of Israel's commitment to God, though the latter was only derived from the former. Here lies the foundation for the covenantal marriage and the whole relationship between Yahweh and Israel, and here lie the ingratitude and infidelity of Israel's seeking after other gods. The prophets even castigated the cult of Yahweh when its worship became mere form and not an expression of the heart. The experience of 586 cut off the cult and the other secondary securities so that Israel was forced to realize her utter dependence on God. Even here God's action was moved by love,³ and

¹ Ibid., p. 135: "The one thing of which all Old Testament writers are certain is that God's love for Israel was not because of anything that Israel had done or was." T. F. Torrance, The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948), p. 10: "The dominant thought throughout is the amazing choice of Israel by God as grounded only in his free and unlimited love and as creating a community in fellowship with God who bestows himself upon them as Father and Savior for ever."

² Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, pp. 38, 39: "As all the prophets declared, his past mercies laid upon Israel the constraint of love, and called for loyalty, and without loyalty she renounced her covenant and repudiated her Deliverer.... Only by such loyalty could Israel make possible God's continued revelation of his character in his dealings with her, and so through her declare himself to the nations." Cf. Jacob, op. cit., p. 209.

³ Jacob, op. cit., p. 111: The prophets "were all firmly persuaded that the motives of the divine action were inspired by its ultimate purpose. God loves his people in order to achieve his aim with them, that is to say the establishment of his kingship over the world."

it sought only love in response.

Israel's call to live by the will of God meant that her service was an expression of his love and must spring from her obedient love.¹ The call to service was itself her greatest privilege and therein he showed his love. Israel's service must come from the heart. Her disobedience to his will was an offense against his love, but his punishment of her sin was a further manifestation of his love.

Israel's reflection of Yahweh's nature was to be seen primarily in her motivation by love. Thus love underlies the ethical system, and the root of Israel's sinful conduct lay in her sinful heart.

Finally, as it was revealed that God's rule and purpose included the nations, this meant also that his love would extend beyond Israel through her service. Here, too, God's love was to become her love, even in suffering for her adversaries. This is the culminating interpretation of Israel's mission.

The conclusions that derive from this brief study of election are very significant for the Old Testament theology of mission. Even such a general survey indicates the importance of election in the prophetic interpretation of Israel's mission and the importance of mission in Israel's life. In election is found the first phase of the mission in terms of purpose and love.

First, in election God creates and calls Israel for his own purpose. Therefore Israel's life must be seen in terms of the mission defined by God's will. Second, God's motive in election is love. Therefore Israel's calling can only be fulfilled by responsive love. Third, purpose and love are one in God's self-revelation. Therefore Israel's whole life is to be given in her

¹Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 166: "Loyalty to God always involves the discharge of the task which is the corollary of election."

mission, as her purpose and love carry out God's purpose and love.

This study of election has also pointed the way toward the rest of the interpretation of Israel's mission. In election God calls Israel into a peculiar relationship to himself, the covenant, and his election is fulfilled in service. Election is the source of Israel's mission, the first phase of her purpose and love. The next phase, the covenant, is the relationship of Israel's mission. It will be followed by the final phase, service, the goal of Israel's mission.

RACERASE BOND

SOUTHWORTH CO.

U.S.A.

B. COVENANT:

If election is the primary concept for the prophetic interpretation of Israel's role in history, then covenant must be called the central concept. In the covenant idea is found the whole understanding of God's relationship with his people, which was created by election. In fact it can be said that "Yahwism and covenant are coterminous."¹ "For the Old Testament foundations of the Church the most important subject is the covenant (berith)."² It is fundamental to the life and mission of Israel as the people of God.

The covenant is not an isolated entity but arises out of election, although it is considered separately here for the purposes of analysis. The importance of the covenant and its organic relationship to election are stated historically and theologically in the prophetic materials.³ When God delivered Israel from Egyptian bondage, he brought them to Sinai. When God created Israel as his own people, he entered into a covenant with them. Election defines the source of Israel's life, and covenant defines the basic relationship of that life.

¹ J. Bright, A History of Israel (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 146.

² H. S. Gehman, "The Covenant--The Old Testament Foundation of the Church," Theology Today, VII/1, p. 26. Cf. W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, vol. I, trans. J.A. Baker (London: SCM Press, 1961), *passim*.

³ Bright, *op. cit.*, p. 137: "These features--election and covenant, the stipulation of covenant and its promises--were of the structure of Israel's faith from the beginning, and so remained throughout all her history. Though the passing years brought many developments, Israel's faith never essentially changed character."

SOUTHWORTH CO.

U.S.A.

The importance of covenant is seen by its dominant position in the Old Testament.¹ A survey of the Torah and the Nebiim indicates the centrality and prevalence of ברית.² The J materials, including Gen. 2-11, give the history of God's acts as "a chain of blessings." The knowledge of the name of Yahweh goes back to Seth (Gen. 4:26). There is a development from the propitiating sacrifice of Noah to the covenant sacrifice of Abraham. "Abraham and his posterity are set apart in the divine purpose (cf. 8:20-22, 15:7ff., 26:24, 27:29a)."³ The covenant with Moses is sealed by a sacrificial meal at Sinai (Ex. 24:1, 2, 9-11). According to E it is to Moses that Yahweh reveals his name in connection with the deliverance from Egypt (Ex. 3:14), and it is with the Israelite confederation that the covenant is made (Ex. 19:4, 5) at Horeb. D uses the idea of the covenant with a particular emphasis and preference,⁴ because of its concern for the teaching of the law. Deuteronomy is concerned with the historical event of the covenant (Deut. 5:2, 3), i.e. with Moses at Horeb, but also with the continuing relationship of the covenant. Yahweh's relationship with Israel is unique, and in this relationship are the obligations (the commandments, statutes, and judgments) which guide the life of Israel. In P it is important that the covenant goes back to Abraham because this source is post-exilic and stresses the everlasting nature of God's relation-

¹G. E. Wright, The Challenge of Israel's Faith (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 74: "In the background of practically all Israelite writing was the conception of the covenanted community."

²This survey is based on Gehman, op. cit., pp. 26-41.

³Ibid., p. 31.

⁴Ibid., p. 32.

ship with Israel; its origin is found in God's grace even before the ceremonial law was established (Gen. 17:1, 2). Sinai, with its detailed ceremonial law, is only a renewal or development of this covenant. And P takes the divine covenant back beyond Abraham. A universal outlook is found in God's covenant with Noah (Gen. 9:8-17), in which all humanity stands in an everlasting relationship to God. Another high point in the priestly writings is found further back, in the creation narrative of Gen. 1: "The whole world and all mankind are brought into an intimate relationship with the glorious, loving God of Israel."¹ This universal outlook does not, however, eliminate the place of Israel; all others can approach God only by becoming a part of Israel. In any case it can be stated that the covenant is of central importance in P² and in the Pentateuch as a whole.

A survey of the Nebiim substantiates the importance of the covenant concept. The very reality of the word of God to Israel upon which the ministry of the prophets was based and with which their message was wholly concerned implies the covenantal relationship between God and Israel, even though the prophets did not all use the term berith.³ These men saw the

¹T. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, trans. S. Neuwen (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 52, 53.

²Gehman, op. cit., p. 34: "In the document P the berith is of central importance; the whole religion is comprehended in berith. All the emphasis lies upon the act of God in making himself known: 'I will be your God' (cf. Gen. 17:7b)."

³See R. Young, Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible, 8th ed. (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), pp. 207, 208. E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958), pp. 213, 214, points out that the event of the covenant is less prevalent in some prophetic writings because the faith of Israel is not bound "to the historical events themselves but to the objective realities created by

seriousness of Israel's plight historically (the powers of the North) and theologically (the sins of the people) and called Israel back to her foundation in the covenant, back to covenant obedience. Israel was the people of God, and her role in history was interpreted in terms of her relationship to God. Because of Israel's continual breaking of the covenant and the coming disasters, the prophets were forced to look ahead to a new covenant, a remnant, a new age.

This survey of the Law and the Prophets indicates that the covenant is of central importance in the prophetic interpretation of Israel's role. It follows election as the second phase of her mission. The next step is to look at several important passages which set forth the meaning of the covenant and its motivation.

It has already been mentioned that there are several events in Israel's history which are referred to as covenants. It is generally agreed, however, that the basic covenant in prophetic thought was the covenant established in the days of Moses.¹

On the third new moon after the people of Israel had gone forth out of the land of Egypt, on that day they came into the wilderness of Sinai.... And Moses went up to God, and the Lord called him out of the mountain, saying, "Thus you shall say to Israel: You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself. Now therefore, if you will obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own possession among all peoples;

those events." It is the close relationship which is important. Also, the Sinai theme was eclipsed by and included within the exodus theme. Bright, *op. cit.*, p. 133, and Gehman, *op. cit.*, pp. 31, 32, indicate that the term may have been avoided at times because of certain connotations, e.g. juridical, but that the very existence of Israel was certainly considered to have been founded on the covenant at Sinai, even by those who did not refer to it.

¹J. O. Cobham, "Covenant," A Theological Wordbook of the Bible, ed. A. Richardson (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957), p. 55: "It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Horeb-Sinai covenant was the original as it was certainly in the minds of the prophets the fundamental covenant."

for all the earth ¹is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.

The deliverance from Egypt was brought to completion at Sinai when God established a bond of personal relationship with his people. It was this covenant which bound Israel to her Lord; it was this bond which was held to have united the heterogeneous tribal elements together in the wilderness; and it was the memory of this experience which provided the foundation of the new nation in the promised land.²

From this primary event the covenant idea was extended forward and backward in Israel's history. "The covenant idea acted as a history-molding force; the inner dynamic of the covenant idea set the unorganized traditions of pre-history under the teleological thought of divine election."³ It was extended back especially to Abraham and the patriarchs, and also to Noah, and its influence can be seen in the concept of man's creation in the image of God. It was extended forward to Joshua (Josh. 24:25) and renewed many times in Israel's subsequent history.

The basic elements of the covenant are found already in the eighth century prophets.⁴ The message of Amos appears to be mostly negative,

¹Ex. 19:1, 3-6a.

²Bright, op. cit., p. 134: "As the memory of these events was brought to Palestine by the group experiencing them, and as the amphictyony was formed about Yahwistic faith, exodus and Sinai became the normative tradition of all Israel:" Cf. R. B. Y. Scott, The Relevance of the Prophets (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), p. 120.

³Gehman, op. cit., p. 31.

⁴N. H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1944), p. 108: "The seeds of all subsequent developments of the ideas of both chesed and covenant are to be found in Amos and Hosea, each representing one strand in the double cord, the one dealing with the requirements of God in the covenant, and the other more particularly with God's persistent love towards his covenant people."

concerned with pronouncing judgment against the Northern Kingdom. In fact he held out almost no hope for Israel. But all these words of judgment reflect the requirements of the covenant.

Thus says the Lord:

"For three transgressions of Israel,
and for four, I will not revoke the punishment;
because they sell the righteous for silver,
and the needy for a pair of shoes--
they that trample the head of the poor into the dust of the earth,
and turn aside the way of the afflicted;
a man and his father go in to the same maiden,
so that my holy name is profaned;
they lay themselves down beside every altar
upon garments taken in pledge;
and in the house of their God they drink,¹
the wine of those who have been fined."

Amos stands in the great ethical tradition of Israel's faith; he condemns the widespread injustice, the shameless immorality, and the wanton sacrilege of the people. For Amos and his successors the standard was not merely an ethical code, however, but what they knew of God's nature. "It was because they were so passionately religious that they were so insistently ethical. Knowledge of God came first, and the understanding of ethical action second."² Religion was a reflection of the God whose mighty acts delivered and established Israel; it was to hate evil and seek good "so that the Lord, the God of hosts, will be with you."³ It was probably because of dead and corrupt formalism of religion that Amos emphasized the requirements of the relationship with God and his judgment upon disobedience rather than the covenant itself.

¹Amos 2:6-8

²Snaith, op. cit., p. 60.

³Amos 5:14, 15.

Hosea, like Amos, feared the destruction of the Northern Kingdom, but, unlike Amos, he himself came from the North. Perhaps because this was his own people, he stressed the other main aspect of the Covenant, God's steadfast love, and showed great compassion throughout his message. Hosea's teaching on the covenant also reflects his experience with Gomer; he uses the marriage figure to portray not only God's choice of Israel but also his enduring relationship with his people. The ideal upon which he looks back and for which he seeks a renewal is Israel's marriage in the wilderness.

What shall I do with you, O Ephraim?
 What shall I do with you, O Judah?
 Your love is like a morning cloud,
 like the dew that goes early away.
 Therefore I have hewn them by the prophets,
 I have slain them by the words of my mouth,
 and my judgment goes forth as the light.
 For I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice,
 the knowledge of God, rather than burnt offerings.
 But at Adam they transgressed the covenant;
 there they dealt faithlessly with me.¹

But Hosea believes that God will not give up his people though they have forsaken him. Just as his covenant is founded on his gracious love ($\overline{\text{ח}}\overline{\text{ס}}\overline{\text{ד}}\overline{\text{ו}}\overline{\text{ח}}$), so it is maintained by his steadfast love ($\overline{\text{ח}}\overline{\text{ס}}\overline{\text{ד}}\overline{\text{ו}}\overline{\text{ח}}$). And in the continuance of this covenant God seeks loving loyalty ($\overline{\text{ח}}\overline{\text{ס}}\overline{\text{ד}}\overline{\text{ו}}\overline{\text{ח}}$) in response. In the covenant the binding motive of God toward Israel (Hos. 2:19), of Israel toward God (Hos. 6:6), and of the people among themselves (Hos. 4:1) is love (chesed).²

But even when God's steadfast love is answered by Israel's harlotry, it remains

¹ Hos. 6:4-7.

² Jacob, op. cit., p. 105.

steadfast.¹ This relationship is the primary concern of Hosea's religion.

The covenant is central in the book of Deuteronomy, which states that Israel's existence and prosperity are dependent on the maintenance of the covenant.

Know therefore that the Lord your God is God, the faithful God who keeps covenant and steadfast love with those who love him and keep his commandments, to a thousand generations, and requites to their face those who hate him, by destroying them; he will not be slack with him who hates him, he will requite him to his face. You shall therefore be careful to do the commandment, and the statutes, and the ordinances, which I command you this day. And because you hearken to these ordinances, and keep and do them, the Lord your God will keep with you the covenant and the steadfast love which he swore to your fathers to keep; he will love you, bless you, and multiply you; he will also bless the fruit of your body and the fruit of your ground....²

Because this relationship is the basic factor of Israel's life, it is essential that they fulfill their obligations to Yahweh in the covenant.

Deuteronomy brings together a wide range of traditions, including "all the departments of Israel's life" in its comprehensive, theological statement of the covenant.³ The whole life of the people is to be regulated in terms of the covenant relationship with Yahweh. Although presented as the farewell speech of Moses, Deuteronomy stresses the existential offer of salvation and the challenge to obedience. It does tend toward a legal and conditional presentation of the covenant. But it must be remembered that the covenant's

¹Snaith, *op. cit.*, p. 111: "Hosea's own domestic experience taught him what chesed could mean to Jehovah. Because of his own attitude to his wayward wife, he came to know that the chesed of God meant God's steadfast determination to be true to his share of the covenant obligation whatever Israel did on her part. Hosea's love for Gomer-bath-Diblaim was so strong and sure that not all her adulteries could kill it. He realized that Jehovah's love for Israel was at least as sure and strong as his own love for his wife. Jehovah's love was both a 'sure love' and a 'love unswerving.'"

²Deut. 7:9-13a.

³G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, trans. D. Stalker (London: SCM Press, 1953), p. 71.

foundation in God's election and love are presented not merely as God's offer to the people in the wilderness but also as his present offer to the people of the disintegrating kingdom after six centuries of sin and apostasy.¹ God's covenant is founded in 'ahabah and chesed'; here lies Israel's hope and her true response.

The prophet Jeremiah was probably associated with the Deuteronomic reform under Josiah in his concern for repentance and reform. His message was also similar to Hosea's in its compassion and its emphasis on God's steadfast love; he, too, used the figures of father-son (Jer. 31:20) and husband-wife (Jer. 2:1-2, 3:1-13) to describe God's relationship to his people. Throughout his ministry, which he disclosed in all its anguish, Jeremiah entered into God's love and purpose for Israel by his utter devotion to his people; he felt the pain of their rejection of himself along with their rejection of God.² He brings out in personal terms the relation between God and man; for him the essence of religion is "the humble walk with God," "the fellowship of prayer," "the soul's intercourse with God."³ Therefore he thinks of covenant not only in terms of God's steadfast love and Israel's rebellion but in terms of a New Covenant, in which God's people, individually, will be given new hearts with which to respond and obey.

Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like

¹ Ibid., pp. 71-73.

² H. T. Kuist, Jeremiah (London: SCM Press, 1960), pp. 8, 17, etc.

³ H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1960), p. 59. Kuist, op. cit., p. 27: "No book of the Bible illuminates more clearly how and why God converses with man than this Book of Jeremiah." Cf. R. Kittel, The Religion of the People of Israel, trans. R.C. Mickletham (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1925), pp. 152, 153.

the covenant which I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant which they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And no longer shall each man teach his neighbor and each his brother, saying, "Know the Lord," for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.¹

"It is in the Second Isaiah, however, that the prophetic significance of the covenant idea receives its greatest deepening."² As in Jeremiah, the fulfillment of the divine plan of salvation is an everlasting covenant of the future in which God's people will be restored to their land and his rule (Is. 54:10, 55:3). In this consummation of the covenant Israel not only receives and reflects God's revelation; as his servant she embodies his will and her life is his revelation. The responsibility rests on both the individual and the nation; its scope reaches out to the nations. And in the Servant Songs (Is. 42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, 52:13-53:12) there is revealed a new development in the idea of the covenant. Its full meaning is brought out in a person who is himself the Servant, the embodiment of the covenant. It is in the Servant that Israel's mission is completed--in his perfect obedience to God and in his self-sacrifice for all men. But the fact that these songs identify the Servant as an individual does not take away the service of Israel; it merely brings it to completion.³

¹ Jer. 31:31-34.

² Gehman, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

³ The problem of the identity of the Servant may never be solved altogether, but a general solution may be found in the fluidity of Hebrew thought between the group and the individual. H.H. Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament (London: Carey Press, 1944), p. 53: "The Servant is Israel, the whole community called to be a missionary community; the Servant is also the individual

"It is too light a thing that you should be my servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob
and to restore the preserved of Israel;
I will give you as a light to the nations,
that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth."¹

In the whole of Deutero-Isaiah the service of God is based on the close relationship of the covenant. This relationship enables Israel, its members, and the future Servant to carry out God's mission of redemption throughout the world. This relationship is necessary to any service of God, and it necessarily leads to service.

The final step in this study of the covenant² is to present its theological implications. Because this concept is so central in the prophetic materials and so important for Israel's role in history, it is crucial for any Old Testament theology of mission. The purpose here is to gather together and set in order some of the basic elements, following the double strand of the topic. These theological implications carry those of election one step further.

First, the covenant, like election, must be viewed teleologically. Throughout the prophetic materials it is clear that God established this bond with his people so that they might serve him; the prophets continually called for repentance and obedience so that Israel might fulfill the purposes of God. and since this relationship was historically and theologically the center of

Jew who is called to make that mission his own, that through him it might be fulfilled; the Servant is also, and especially, One Who should supremely in Himself embody that mission, and who should carry it to a point no other should reach." For the Hebrew concept of corporate and individual personality cf. A. R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, 2nd ed. (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961). For a discussion of the theories of the identity of the Servant cf. H. H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), pp. 1-57.

¹Is. 49:6.

²The meaning of the covenant is not limited to references to ברית; it is found in all the terms, figures, and discussions which describe the relationship between God and Israel.

Israel's life,¹ her whole life was to be involved in God's service. This is the meaning of Israel's existence as the people of God.

The relationship between Israel and Yahweh was founded on God's gracious election, and it was offered by him as salvation. It was a relationship of God's choice, not of kinship or locality. It was never meant to be merely a legal, contractual bargain.² It was not a relationship of equals but the relationship of the sovereign God and a small, helpless, dependent people. This was clear in the story of the wilderness wanderings, and it became especially clear in the events of 722 and 586; to the prophets it was always clear. The covenant was primarily God's condescension to Israel, enabling her to become his people and bear his name.

Nevertheless this relationship was not one of coercion but of cooperation.³ God brought Israel to Sinai and there offered himself as their God. If they would be his people, they must of their own volition worship him and have no other gods. The fact that they often rejected him proves that the worship of Yahweh was one of free response. When they worshiped Yahweh with their whole heart they were truly his people, a witness to the nations. But when their worship became impure and when they sought other gods, they turned from the source of their life; they had no witness among the nations. God's purpose in the covenant was to be seen in Israel's response to him.

¹Bright, op. cit., p. 133: "There can scarcely be any doubt that Israel's very existence was founded on the belief that her ancestors had at Sinai covenanted with Yahweh to be his people."

²Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 46.

³H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (London: Carey Press, 1953), p. 102: The covenant bond "was not an inevitable one, but one willingly accepted. It began in constraint laid upon man by the grace of God, but it was in the free response to that constraint and in the freely pledged loyalty of the heart that it was sealed." Cf. Scott, op. cit., pp. 120, 121.

God's purpose in the covenant was to be seen also in Israel's obedience to his will. Much of the prophetic materials is given to the fact that God has a purpose for Israel, that Israel must fulfill his will.¹ The covenant is the framework in which we see the struggle of a stubborn and stiff-necked people, who are continually called upon to obey and follow the Lord and who continually disobey and follow their own way. The cycle of fellowship-disobedience-punishment-repentance-fellowship, e.g. in Judges, indicates that the covenant relationship was supposed to bring Israel's will into line with God's purpose so that she might serve him. Obedience to the covenant was righteousness; transgression was sin.

The extent and nature of this willing service are given in all the prophetic writings, though not with unanimity. The law of God was the rule of Israel's life from the time of Moses; the Torah had great significance.² But various traditions emphasized cultic practices, legal codes, the festivals, corporate and individual piety, political and social integrity and justice, etc. Some of the prophets seemingly opposed the cult altogether, and there were other conflicts. But the basic reality toward which they all point is that there is a covenant relationship between God and his people and that Israel's willing service is to be carried out in every aspect of her life.

Since it gradually became clear that God's purpose included all the nations, it also became certain that Israel's service must extend beyond her own people. The fact that there was a unique relationship between God and

¹Gehman, op. cit., p. 28: "The authority of the divine covenant-will subordinated the whole national life to its purposes."

²Wright, op. cit., p. 42: "The law is the revelation of God's will for man. It is exceedingly important, for it is the divine constitution for the regulation of society. Man's duty is to obey it; and if he does not, he rebels against God."

Israel often tended towards a particularism in which foreigners were despised. The strict requirements of Israel's separation during the occupation of Canaan under Joshua and the return from exile under Ezra seem to militate against Israel's mission to the nations. Similarly the attitude toward other nations at times assumed the character of imperialism. The true meaning of the covenant, however, as this has been revealed by the New Testament heirs of the covenant, was that God's unique relationship with Israel should issue in her unique service for him in the world. Deutero-Isaiah provides the culmination of this realization in the concept of the Servant of Yahweh, who gives himself so that the heathen, too, might know the salvation of God.

The other aspect of this consideration of the covenant, besides purpose, is its motivation. At this level, as well as in election, love¹ is the motive by which God and his people are moved in mission. As God chose Israel out of love, he also entered into the unique relationship of the covenant by love. The covenant was created and maintained by God's steadfast love.²

Because God gave himself and his name to Israel in love, her privilege and her obligation was to respond out of love—in her worship and devotion.

¹In addition to חַסֵּד (see p. 37) the word אֱמֻנָה is important for the understanding of love in the covenant. Snaith, op. cit., p. 104, translates chesed as "covenant-love" because it is especially used of "faithfulness in the covenant between Jehovah and Israel, both of the firm faithfulness of God, and of the fitful faithfulness of Israel." P. 123: "The content of the word chesed developed side by side with that of the idea of the covenant." Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 22, prefers "loyalty." According to Jacob, op. cit., p. 104, chesed is "the power which guarantees a covenant and makes it strong and durable." In any case it is the key term for the binding force of the covenant, and it falls within our conception of love.

²Gehman, op. cit., p. 30: "Yet out of love he remained faithful to the covenant." G. Quell and E. Stauffer, Love, trans. from TWNT by J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958), p. 11: "The whole covenant theory is based on the idea of love."

The prophets used marriage as the best image to describe this relationship, and the sins of the people were best described as adultery. The loyalty of Israel, whether henotheism or monotheism, and the devotion of her people, whether as a nation or as individuals, expressed the true nature of the people of Yahweh. And this was not a marriage of convenience by which Israel gained advantages or a hold on God; it was "a call to unreserved devotion or surrender to God."¹ When the prophets eventually realized that the nation would not respond aright, they looked for a remnant or an individual who would fulfill the covenant.

Israel's loyalty to God was to be seen by her obedience to his will. But this obedience was never meant to lead to strict legalism or mere formalism. The prophets opposed this kind of sham and called for a true heart, obedience motivated by love.²

Therefore love was the foundation underlying all the ethical and religious requirements; love was to permeate the life of the covenant people.³ In this way Israel's life was to be a reflection of the nature of Yahweh.

¹Gehman, op. cit., p. 30. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 46: "Again and again the thought is expressed that by his deliverance of Israel God had a claim on her loyalty, and that she who was his people, bound to him by a sacred covenant, was pledged to give him that loyalty."

²Wright, op. cit., pp. 73, 74: "The obligations which the covenant imposes on the contracting parties are expressed in various ways. Yet they are summed up in the word chesed."

³Quell and Stauffer, op. cit., p. 6: "The dominant position given to the idea of love constitutes the great glory of Old Testament ethics. Love is regarded as inseparable from humanity, and therefore set forth as the norm of social relationship and included within the scope and shelter of the divine law." J. Pedersen, Israel; Its Life and Culture, I-II, trans. A. Møller (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), describes the psychological background for love in Israel, calling it the natural expression of the soul in relation to others of the family, tribe, and nation (p. 310). Love is the cement which binds Israelite society together. The law of love (Lev. 19:18) leads to unity and peace. Sin kills love because it prevents this normal interrelationship (p. 414).

When it finally became clear that Israel's mission would extend out to the nations, the meaning of the fellowship of God's love was expanded to include all people.

It is interesting to note that these insights into the mission and motive of Israel as the covenant community were given by the great prophets, who themselves experienced the reality of which they spoke. Unlike their early predecessors who were gripped by ecstasy, these men spoke out of conviction and compassion.¹ As spokesmen for God they were so united to him that they reflected his purpose and love by their words and their lives.

The conclusions that derive from this study of the covenant are similar to those derived from election, although they are here brought one step further. It is clear that the covenant relationship between God and his people is central in the prophetic interpretation of Israel's role in history and the foundation upon which her service is built. The purpose and love of God are revealed in the covenant, which is the second phase of Israel's mission.

First, in the covenant God enters into a personal relationship with Israel so that she might willingly follow him. Therefore Israel's life is to be a conscious fulfillment of God's purpose. Second, God's purpose toward Israel in the covenant is motivated by love. Therefore Israel's true response must be out of love. Third, God's purpose and love are one in his commitment to Israel. Therefore Israel's purpose and love must express her total commitment to God.

The election of Israel leads to the covenant relationship and ends in

¹ N. H. Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice; A Study of the Book of Hosea (London: SCM Press, 1953), p. 18: "The new type of prophet, exemplified first in Hosea and Amos, was then definitely and fully aware of what he said and did. He said and did it deliberately and out of settled conviction. The man speaks out of that which he is certain is God's Word in and through him. It is that of which

service. It remains to consider the final phase of this Old Testament theology of mission, service, the goal of election and covenant.

he is certain in his own heart." Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 111: "The true prophet is thought of as one who stands in so close and intimate a relationship with God that his personality becomes the vehicle of God's word. In a real sense he becomes one with God, or an extension of God's personality."



C. SERVICE:

As election is primary and the covenant central in the prophetic interpretation of Israel's role in history, service is the final concept, which brings this interpretation to completion. From all that has been said above, it should be clear that the end of election and covenant is service; the prophetic call to service was based on election and covenant. God's people are called to serve him—to receive his revelation, to reflect that revelation in their life, and finally to share it with all men.¹ This section proposes to show the place and importance of service, its completion of election and covenant, and its later eschatological projection.

The fact and importance of Israel's vocation in the service of God are seen throughout the prophetic materials. The international scope of Israel's mission is found already in J, which presents the election of Abraham "as an episode which, standing out against the plan of universal history, is to pour forth as a blessing upon it."² The miraculous acts of God in Israel's history are set within a universal framework. The rule of God over the nations is seen in the deliverance from Egypt, and Israel's vocation is exhibited negatively in her constant disloyalty and unbelief.³ E tends toward religious nationalism in its emphasis on separation, but it does show a positive side of Israel's vocation in the piety of her national figures.⁴ D is primarily

¹H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1950), pp. 59, 68, 94, 118.

²E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958), p. 217.

³T. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, trans. S. Neuwen (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 45, 46.

⁴Ibid., p. 47.

concerned with Israel's service as God's chosen people by faithful obedience to his commandments. But here again, as in J, there is a wider perspective; a centripetal kind of mission can be seen in the admission of proselytes (Deut. 23:2-8) and in the story of Naaman.¹ This viewpoint is found also in P, which sets the world in relation to God in so far as the world comes to Israel. But for P the role of Israel is set more definitely in the universal purpose and rule of God in the Noahic covenant and the creation narrative. Election and covenant are part of a religion of revelation which includes a universal plan of salvation.² Although the strands of the Pentateuch never actively related Israel's mission to this universal framework, her service to God was a dominant element throughout and the universal context was never forgotten.

The Books of the Prophets themselves are thoroughly concerned with Israel's service as the people of God and are always mindful of the international context of Israel's history. These men saw that election and covenant must lead to service and that unless this service were forthcoming Israel would be destroyed. By failing to give service Israel broke her covenant and renounced her election. But the prophets knew that it was God's sovereign purpose which was the basis of Israel's life and service, and they came to see that even though he would destroy her he would yet enable her to fulfill her service in a new way. The people often took Israel's unique position as a sign of their superiority and privilege; this distortion led to despair in 722 and 586. The prophets

¹Jacob, op. cit., p. 219.

²H. S. Gehman, "The Covenant--The Old Testament Foundation of the Church," Theology Today, VII/1, p. 34.

interpreted Israel's role among the nations in terms of her service as God's people; their faith carried on through catastrophe toward an eschatological fulfillment. e/

Throughout the prophetic materials election, covenant, and service are fundamental to Israel's role as the people of God. Service is the final phase of her mission. The next step is to consider some important passages which illuminate the nature and motivation of this service.

As with election and covenant there is here, too, some question as to the significance of the patriarchal period. At least it should be noted that several important references (J) indicate that in God's call to Abraham (and Isaac and Jacob) "all the families of the earth will bless themselves."¹ The meaning is that Israel's calling shall bring her such blessing that the other nations will seek a like blessing.² Admittedly this is only a rudimentary stage in the development of Israel's mission to the world, but it is significant that the election and covenant of Israel are already linked so closely with the well-being of the nations.

It is important to see that the call to service goes back to the foundation of Israel's life in election and covenant. In Moses we find the foundation for all three, which are organically related in Israel's history and theology of

¹Gen. 12:3b: "By you all the families of the earth will bless themselves." Cf. Gen. 18:18, 22:18, 26:4, 28:14. The RSV translates all of these passages similarly, giving as an alternate reading in the margin "be blessed," which is used by the KJV. The former rendering is generally accepted today. See H. H. Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament (London: The Carey Press, 1944), pp. 24-27; The Biblical Doctrine of Election, pp. 65, 66.

²Ibid. Jacob, op. cit., p. 217, however, goes further: "The solemnity of the formula and especially the general plan of the Yahwist's book provoke us rather to see between Abraham and the peoples a relationship of cause and effect and the assertion of the universal mission of the people of Israel."

history. Moses was called to proclaim Israel's calling as the people of God; his mission was to bring them out of bondage so that they might serve God.¹ The deliverance was an expression of God's grace toward the helpless which claimed their loyalty, and it was an expression of his concern for justice which determined the ethical nature of Israel's service. Moses brought the people out of Egypt; they were united with Yahweh at Sinai; and a theocratic way of life was established for God's service. And again the universal context is in view.² Therefore Moses stands at the head of the prophetic movement and of the prophetic interpretation of Israel's mission. He was himself the first missionary.³

The eighth century prophets take up the work of Moses, stressing the service which Israel must give on the basis of election and covenant. Amos is especially concerned for social justice as the necessary reflection of God's revelation; for him the ethical behavior of his people is an imperative based on the nature of God himself.⁴ Where God's will is not carried out, he speaks

¹ God's election of Israel through the deliverance under Moses (Ex. 3:10, see p. 27 above) is coupled with her service (v. 12b): "When you have brought forth the people out of Egypt you shall serve God upon this mountain." Cf. the introduction to the Decalogue (Ex. 20:2). This service is carried out through the covenant (Ex. 19:1-6, see p. 38 above).

² Ex. 19:5b, 6a: "You shall be my own possession among all peoples; for all the earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."

³ Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, pp. 14, 15; The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 31. Jacob, op. cit., p. 217, calls Moses a missionary to his own people first and then also to the Egyptians.

⁴ Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 57: "The standards laid down for men were set by the character of God himself. That is why the religion of the Old Testament is described as an ethical religion."

in judgment. And this ethical rule and judgment of God extend abroad to the surrounding nations. Because Israel's unique place has not issued in unique service, her punishment will be especially severe.¹ Amos emphasizes the international context and the ethical character of Israel's service. God's purpose in both is emphasized negatively by the harshness of his judgment.

In Hosea, as has been seen, the emphasis is on the relationship between God and Israel, which underlies true service. The service of God is primarily the reception of and response to God's love. Hosea does not vitiate the moral urgency of this service; rather he goes beneath cult and conduct and finds the motivation for true service in 'ahabah and chesed. With Amos he expects terrible punishment to come upon Israel, but his faith is in the love of God which motivates his purposes and in the sovereignty of that love which is able to go beyond Israel's faithlessness.²

The book of Deuteronomy lays special emphasis on all three phases of Israel's mission. There is a logical connection between its emphasis on election and covenant and its insistence on obedience to the commandments of God.³ Since Israel has received God's grace in her deliverance and lives in personal relationship with him, her calling is to give faithful loyalty to

¹ Amos 3:1, 2. These two verses contain the three elements, election, covenant (✓ ḥ ḥ), and service (negatively).

² N. H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1944), p. 113, deprecates the tendency to consider all mention of restoration in Amos and Hosea as later additions. N. K. Gottwald, A Light to the Nations (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 303, points out that Hosea sees God's judgment as the obverse side of God's love, as redemptive rather than retributive.

³ Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 48.

God which will be seen throughout the life of her people. It is this continuing response and service which fulfill Israel's mission, rather than an automatic status of election. The absolute service and the absolute motivation which are central in Deuteronomy are seen together in Deut. 10:12: "to love him, to serve the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." The whole life of the people of God is bound to give him service—in worship and in all the social, political, and economic life. Israel's life lay in obedience; her blessing lay in service—in receiving and reflecting God's revelation. Although there is some admission of foreigners (Deut. 23:7, 8), the relationship towards the nations is generally particularistic.

Jeremiah's contribution in his concern for personal religion has been considered in terms of his own election (Jer. 1:5)¹ and in the eschatological fulfillment of the covenant (Jer. 31:31-34). Like Hosea he realized the importance of genuine motivation in Israel's response to God; true service must come from the heart. He knew that Israel was given her unique position for the service of God and that service was the necessary result of her election and covenant.² The context is the nations. Jeremiah was himself appointed to be a "prophet to the nations." In his prophecies Israel is God's chosen people, but God rules the nations. Therefore even Nebuchadnezzar serves God in punish-

¹This verse links election ("I formed you"), covenant ("I knew you"), and service ("I appointed you a prophet") in God's call to Jeremiah.

²Jer. 7:23: "But this command I gave them, 'Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my people; and walk in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you.'"

ing Israel (Jer. 25:9)¹; therefore the word of the Lord is pronounced over all the nations (Jer. 46-51).

Up to this point much is found in the prophetic materials concerning Israel's service, the fulfillment of election and covenant. Although there is so far no direct turning of the people out toward the nations in mission, the foundation for such a mission has already been laid. It is clear that Israel is called to give her entire life in service to God and that love is the basic motive for this service. The unique place of Israel among the nations is obvious throughout. It only remains to make the connection between Israel, the servant of God, and the nations whom she must serve.²

In the Old Testament the most important material for a biblical theology of mission comes from Deutero-Isaiah³; the greatest confluence and climax of election, covenant, and service are found here. This unknown writer of the exile lays the greatest stress on monotheism and its corollary, universalism. Likewise--and in obvious parallel--he emphasizes election and its corollary, service. In the Servant Songs, whatever their origin, Israel's calling and the world-wide scope are finally connected in active mission.⁴

¹ Cf. Jer. 27:6, 43:10. This kind of election for service lies outside the covenant and therefore is different altogether from Israel's election-covenant-service. It does not involve entering into the purpose and love of God but is an involuntary service and has no honor or reward. Cf. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, pp. 121-138.

² Ibid., pp. 59, 60: "Israel's election was not merely for herself and God. It was not simply that she might reflect the will of God in all her own life and delight his heart by so doing. Her election was for service to the world. For she had a mission to the nations."

³ Gehman, op. cit., p. 36.

⁴ Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 62: "It is by no accident that it is the prophet who most stresses monotheism and its corollary of universalism who also most stresses the thought of Israel's election and the corollary of that election in her world mission."

Behold my servant, whom I uphold,
 my chosen, in whom my soul delights;
 I have put my spirit upon him,
 he will bring forth justice to the nations.

He will not fail or be discouraged
 till he has established justice in the earth;
 and the coastlands wait for his law.¹

The development of the prophetic interpretation of Israel's role in history culminates in these passages, in which Israel's service is orientated positively toward the world. Israel's calling is not merely to receive and cherish the revelation of God, but to share that revelation, true religion,² with all men.

These songs also express, with the greatest insight of the prophetic movement and in sharp contrast to the world and to popular Israelite thought, the manner in which this mission is to be carried out.

The Lord God has opened my ear,
 and I was not rebellious,
 I turned not backward.
 I gave my back to the smiters,
 and my cheeks to those who pulled out the beard;
 I hid not my face
 from shame and spitting.³

It is through suffering that Israel's service is to be fulfilled. Out of her close communion with Yahweh Israel learns to withstand blows and insults. This

¹Is. 42:1, 4.

²Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 117: $\text{U} \odot \text{W} \square$ normally means judgment, justice, or custom, but here it probably means true religion; The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), pp. 14, 15: "The thought here is then in harmony with that elsewhere in these songs, and the general conception behind the songs is of a mission of the Servant through suffering to bring the nations into a right relationship with God"; The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, p. 119: "The mission of the Servant is directed to the achievement of the world mission of Israel, whereby she should share with all men the glory of her heritage."

³Is. 50:5, 6.

fulfillment of the covenant in willing, suffering service is directly opposite to Israel's proud rebellion and self-righteous aloofness; it is contrary to worldly concern for power and privilege.¹

Finally, the Servant Songs point toward an eschatological fulfillment in the One who in himself carries out the mission, vicariously, for Israel and for all men. This One is himself the Servant.

Surely he has borne our griefs
and carried our sorrows;
yet we esteemed him stricken,
smitten by God, and afflicted.
But he was wounded for our transgressions,
he was bruised for our iniquities;
upon him was the chastisement that made us whole,
and with his stripes we are healed.
All we like sheep have gone astray;
we have turned every one to his own way;
and the Lord has laid on him
the iniquity of us all.²

Not only is Israel's mission fulfilled in service to the nations and that service carried out by suffering; the Servant gives himself for those at whose hand he dies. By his sacrifice he brings salvation from sin; the arm of the Lord is revealed in him. The purpose and love of God become his mission and motive as he gives himself in service.³ In these passages the

¹Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, p. 60: "The thought here is centered on suffering and shame as the organ of service."

²Is. 53:4-6. Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, p. 63: "In this fourth Song, the prophet's primary thought is of a future individual who shall uniquely fulfill Israel's mission in unique sufferings, borne in unique love."

³Ibid., p. 61: "In this Song we have the great creative idea of a suffering which is redemptive. It redeems not the sufferer, but those who inflict it on him; and it redeems not only by its own virtue, merely because it is suffering, but because of the spirit in which it is endured. The Servant fulfills his mission to the world by suffering at the world's hands, and by yielding his life without struggle or complaint to be a sacrifice for those who slay him."

Old Testament stands on the verge of the New, but these words are also the culmination of a great stream in the prophetic movement.

Although Deutero-Isaiah is the high point of the prophetic interpretation of Israel's mission, this study would not be complete without reference to the book of Jonah; "the importance for the missionary ideal of the book of Jonah cannot be overstressed."¹ Jonah is, however, dissimilar from the other prophetic books, taking the form of a parable. The message is that Israel's election is fulfilled in mission. From the beginning the prophets had realized the superiority of their religion. That the people made the wrong deduction from this fact is illustrated by Jonah, who was angered at the thought of others outside the covenant benefitting from their faith.² The fact of Israel's mission to the nations is made certain by the repentance of Nineveh. Finally Jonah, who probably stood for Israel, was made to see that election and covenant must lead to service and that this service reaches out to the world. Israel's mission was to be fulfilled by her entrance into the purpose and love of God, which include the nations.³ And here it is clear that the nations

¹ Jacob, op. cit., p. 221.

² Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, pp. 67, 68: "It is probable that in /the author's/ thought Jonah stood for the nation, and his mission to Nineveh for Israel's mission to the world. And if so, then unless and until she undertook that mission, she was denying the very purpose of her election, as Jonah was when he turned from Nineveh towards Tarshish."

³ Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, p. 68: "I think the author is describing in the form of his story his own spiritual experience. He was most reluctant to believe that God's love embraced alien peoples, and even oppressors like the Assyrians, and he strove hard to resist it as a disgusting idea, until he was lifted into the divine heart, and shared the glory of its compassion." Jacob, op. cit., pp. 221, 222: "The nations will know in their turn that Israel's God is not only the master of universal history, but that he is merciful and compassionate and that his kingship is fulfilled in his love."

need not come to Jerusalem, for Israel is to go out into the world.

The final step of this study of service, a consideration of the theological implications, can be abbreviated because these implications have already been inferred in connection with election and covenant and in this section. It has been shown throughout that the election of Israel led to her covenant with Yahweh and was to be fulfilled in service.¹ Israel's service was to receive the revelation of God, to reflect it in her life, and finally to convey it to the nations. Israel's complete giving of herself in service was taught throughout the prophetic movement, although this service was only directed toward the nations late in the movement. Throughout the prophetic materials service is a dominant motif and is the completion of election and covenant.

First, service is the completion of the purpose underlying Israel's life. At first passively in her deliverance from Egypt and then actively in her worship and social life and at last externally in overt mission to the nations, Israel was called to serve the purposes of God. The uniqueness of her position in election and covenant was for the purpose of unique, willing service. The completeness of her creation by God's hand and the completeness of her relationship to him define the completeness of her vocation in his service.

Service is also the completion of the motive underlying Israel's life. As God revealed himself to Israel in unconditional love and committed himself to her in love, so Israel was supposed to receive and respond to that love by love, to share that love as it bound her people together, and finally to enter

¹Jacob., op. cit., pp. 203, 204, shows that the link between election and service is evident in the association of the terms "elect" and "servant" and in the use of the pronoun "my" with "servant." "To be the 'am' of Yahweh involves being his 'ed.... To be a servant necessarily implies a mission to fulfill."

into that love as it reached out to all the world.¹ Although there is little explicit reference in the Old Testament to God's love for the world, the two places where the mission to the world is explicit (Deutero-Isaiah and Jonah) amply show that it is love which motivates both God and Israel in this mission. The love in service is an extension of the love in election and covenant, and it is supremely exemplified and expressed in the self-sacrifice of the Servant.

These theological implications of service come from the greatest insights of the prophetic materials regarding Israel's role in history, and they are given against the background of Israel's constant failure to carry them out. The prophets proclaimed God's purpose and love and called Israel to serve him in purpose and love commensurate with their position as his people. As they saw Israel fail to give service, break the covenant, and forfeit her election, they nevertheless looked for God himself to fulfill Israel's mission. In their search for this fulfillment they turned toward a future remnant or individual. They became eschatological in their interpretation of Israel's role. Here the Old Testament converges upon the New; the mission of Israel ultimately points toward the mission of Jesus Christ and of his body, the Church, the New Israel.

The conclusions of this final phase of Israel's mission are similar and complementary to those for election and covenant, for service is the end of election and covenant. First, God's purpose is that Israel serve him. Therefore the only legitimate goal of Israel's life is to give willing service to God. Second, God's purpose is motivated by love. Therefore Israel's service

¹Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, p. 63: "The people of God are called to reflect his character. This is the constant call of the prophets.... Israel then was called to be the extension of the divine personality, to enter into the divine love and suffering."

must be carried out in love. Finally, God's purpose and love are revealed by his self-giving to Israel. Therefore Israel's service must be the complete giving of herself—to God and to the world.

SUMMARY:

In summarizing and evaluating Part I, "The Mission of Israel," we find that the results of this study are significant for a "biblical" theology of mission. From this historical background for the mission of the church, as it is found in the prophetic materials of the Old Testament, there emerges an essential pattern of mission.

Some comments may first be made concerning methodology. The materials used in this study are necessarily selective and limited; nevertheless they are sufficiently central to reveal a general pattern in the prophetic interpretation of Israel's role. They also indicate that this interpretation was at the heart of Israel's faith; it was implicit in the work of Moses, and it fully emerged in the great prophetic period of 750-500 B.C. Although technical problems have been avoided and although conflicting viewpoints have been omitted, the results are of great importance nevertheless. By means of a cross-section an essential unity of thought has been found over a broad amount of material; it can be said to represent the prophetic movement as a whole. This unity expresses the greatest insight into God's revelation in the Old Testament period as this revelation was further illuminated by the events of the New Testament. The importance of the study lies in the integration of familiar materials rather than in the exposure of new materials.

Several important conclusions regarding the form and content of a 'biblical' theology of mission can be derived from this study. First, with regard to form, mission is an all-embracing aspect of the relationship between God and his people. The way in which Israel is involved in mission is defined in terms of three phases which belong in an essential, non-temporal

sequence. Election is primary; it expresses the fact that God's sovereign purpose and love underlie the entire mission without reference to Israel's response. It defines the source of Israel's life and mission. Covenant is central; it indicates that God's purpose and love are to be worked out through the response of his people. It defines the basic relationship of Israel's life and mission. Service is final; it brings to completion God's purpose and love. It defines the goal of Israel's life and mission. The necessity and unity of all three phases is evidenced by the failure of the mission when part is lacking. The organic relationship between the concepts is seen in the emergence of one out of another and in the overlapping of materials. The sequence expresses the inner logic of the mission. The totality of the mission is evident at each level; the entire life of Israel is involved in its mission. The sufficiency of this structure is certain because nothing further of significance can be added. It is here argued that this prophetic interpretation of Israel's mission provides the essential pattern for a "biblical" theology of mission.

Second, with regard to the content of mission, certain conclusions can be derived from the study of the mission of Israel. It is evident throughout the prophetic materials that Israel's mission must be wholly based on the purpose of God. This purpose was interpreted in terms of the worship and conduct of the people and eventually in terms of her mission to the world. It is also evident that the motivation necessary for the fulfillment of the mission was love and that this love was based on God's love. God's love was described in terms of his spontaneous choosing and self-giving and calling of Israel; Israel's love was described as loving response--in utter loyalty and in willing service. These two elements, purpose (mission) and

love (motive), express the reality of God's self-giving to Israel and the ideal of Israel's self-giving in God's service. The cumulative testimony of the prophetic materials is, however, that Israel did not in fact fulfill her mission in this way. The realized content for a "biblical" theology of mission is not found in the Old Testament.

The question therefore arises as to when and how God's purpose and love were fulfilled. At this point the biblical theologian views the whole record of God's saving acts and finds that the mission of Israel was fulfilled in Jesus Christ, the true Servant of Yahweh. He alone fully embodied the love and purpose of God. In the midst of Israel's rejection of her mission he fulfilled that mission by giving himself throughout his life and death. Through his mission a remnant was born to Israel which carried out her mission as God's people in a new election, a new covenant, and a new service.

The final conclusion of this study of the mission of Israel is that the pattern for a "biblical" theology of mission is found in the Old Testament prophetic materials and that the content must be found in the New Testament. A study of the prophets reveals that love is the motive for mission, that the whole life of the people of God is involved in mission, and that mission and love must be seen in this perspective. But the full realization of the love and purpose of God in the mission of his people is found only in Jesus Christ.

PART II: THE MISSION OF JESUS

Part II provides the theological basis for the mission of the church, particularly with regard to love as the motive for mission, as it is found in the mission of Jesus. In Part I the study of the mission of Israel yielded a definite structure for a theology of mission, and this structure indicated the fact, extent, and dynamic of love as the motive for mission. The present study seeks to provide the content for a "biblical" theology of mission, for the life and ministry of Jesus are the supreme expression of love as the motive for mission. A statement of the method of New Testament theology, as it is here applied to the study of Jesus, is necessary by way of introduction.

New Testament theology, like Old Testament theology, utilizes and supercedes the literary and historical study of its materials. Taking the position of faith, it is able to penetrate further into the meaning of the documents because it operates on the same level as the men who wrote them, the communities who preserved and lived by their traditions, and the people who participated in the events with which they are concerned.¹ The biblical theologian is concerned with the Heilsgeschichte presented in the Bible, with theologically significant historical events, with the relationship between God and man contained therein. The center of this history which is revelation is the life

¹B. Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, vol. I, 3rd revised ed., trans. D. Eaton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882), p. 3: "It is only on the assumption that the perfect revelation of God is given in the manifestation of Christ, i.e. in his person and work, as it was commenced during his earthly life and continued after his exaltation, and that, in the oldest and most original monuments of the religious consciousness and life which that manifestation produced, there is secured a documentary attestation of that revelation of God as it ought to be understood and in its full saving value—an attestation which is normative for all time; it is only on this assumption that the representation of the religious ideas and doctrines which are found in the writings can be a special subject of theological science."

of Jesus of Nazareth. Therefore the content for a "biblical" theology of mission must be drawn, primarily and essentially, from the mission of Jesus.

The writings of the New Testament and the traditions underlying them all agree that the events of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection are the decisive manifestation of the purpose and love of God.¹ This is evident in the preaching and teaching, confessions and Christological titles, theology and ethics, worship and life of the early church. The present study will be directed toward the primary source of the actual mission of Jesus, the Synoptic Gospels. The purpose of this study will be to determine the mission and motive of Jesus during his ministry.

The Synoptic materials present a peculiarly complex field of study. The first problem is that they represent not only the historical records of the life and ministry of Jesus but also the church's confession of faith in Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God, etc. They describe the Jesus of history as the Christ of faith. Therefore, although we seek to analyze the mission of the historical Jesus, we must deal with source materials in which historical event and theological interpretation² are integrally bound up together.³

¹O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall (London: SCM Press, 1959), pp. 2, 3: "We can therefore say that early Christian theology is in reality almost exclusively Christology." Cf. V. Taylor, The Person of Christ (London: Macmillan & Co., 1958), p. viii. E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 94: "Jesus Christ is the sole content of the Christian message. This is true in the most stringent sense." "To the primitive church Christology is the center of her message."

²Throughout this section "historical event" refers to the historical Jesus of the ministry, who of course had his own theology, and "theological interpretation" refers to the viewpoint of the early church, which of course gives important historical insight into the primitive church. What we are seeking to determine is the theological outlook of the historical Jesus over against the theological outlook of the early church, which was influenced by subsequent events and dominated by Christological considerations.

³G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960), p. 14: "We possess no single word

Moreover, in seeking to understand the historical Jesus we must also explain the church's faith in Jesus as the Christ.¹ The second problem has to do with the growth and development of the Synoptic tradition. It is now generally agreed that the structure of the Synoptic Gospels does not provide a historical chronicle of Jesus' life,² but it is stated on the other hand that the materials which make up the Gospels contain in themselves a view of the whole ministry of Jesus.³ Literary criticism has clarified the nature of the development of these individual units in the written period of the tradition and has established the priority of Mark's Gospel.⁴ Form criticism has provided an analysis of the forms

of Jesus and no single story of Jesus, no matter how incontestably genuine they may be, which do not contain at the same time the confession of the believing congregation or at least are embedded (sic.) therein." Cf. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1944), p. 94.

¹G. S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man (London: Nisbet & Co., 1947), pp. 3-6, speaks of the twenty year gap between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith as a tunnel, in which the interpreter who works at one end must keep in mind the other also. In particular the historian who leaves unexplained the church's faith increases rather than narrows the gap, and thereby his work stands condemned.

²The starting point for contemporary discussion of this problem in this country is C. H. Dodd, "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative," Expository Times, xliii (June, 1932), pp. 396-400. Cf. D. E. Nineham, "The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel--an Examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis," Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 223-239.

³T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), pp. 66, 67: "It is impossible to exaggerate the closeness of the tie between the teaching of Jesus and his acts. Secondly, there is the principle that a single story or saying may contain the whole Gospel in miniature." Manson cites K. L. Schmidt, Le Problème du Christianisme primitif, p. 25: "Chaque acte et chaque parole de Jésus contient in nuce ce Kerygma." Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 25: "These story scenes give his history not only when pieced together, but each one in itself contains the person and history of Jesus in their entirety."

⁴The epitome of the school of literary criticism is found in the four-source hypothesis of B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels; A Study of Origins (London: Macmillan & Co., 1924).

of these units and has further explained the rationale behind their development in the oral period.¹ Therefore, any study of the historical Jesus must do justice to the results of critical analysis of the source materials. Finally, there is the problem of setting forth a coherent picture of the ministry of Jesus. It is not enough to recognize that there was a Jesus of history who became the Christ of faith, and it is not enough to recognize that the Synoptic materials are colored by the faith of the early church.² We must find a consistent, meaningful view of the historical Jesus underlying these materials.

The present study takes a particular approach to the life and ministry of Jesus in the light of these factors. First, it will concentrate on the nature of Jesus' mission in the strict sense³ because the Synoptic materials represent, besides historical reminiscence, specifically the early church's witness to Jesus as the Messiah. As far as possible a deliberate attempt will be made to avoid the two difficult questions of Christology and eschatology because on the one hand they tend to dominate exegesis while on the other hand they introduce a problematical element into the interpretation of Jesus' ministry.⁴ Second,

¹The "Big Three" of this movement are K. L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Berlin: Trowitsch & Sohn, 1919); M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, trans. B. Lee Woolf (London: Nicholson & Watson, 1934); and R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

²Duncan, op. cit., pp. 17-25, notes that the failure to go back to the historical Jesus is found in such widely divergent positions as Barth and Bultmann and rests upon theological reasons as well as historical scepticism. J. M. Robinson, A New Quest of the Historical Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1959), pp. 85-92, shows that what he calls a "new" quest of the historical Jesus is both legitimate and necessary, not because we need facts to support our faith but simply because we have the means.

³In this study the terms "mission," "mission in the strict sense" are used in contrast to the traditional affirmation or assumption that Jesus' mission was bound up with his consciousness of his own uniqueness.

⁴That these two areas or approaches are difficult and problematical is evident both from the nature of the Synoptic tradition and from the breadth of disagreement in contemporary discussion. They are similar in that they are both

because critical analysis of the materials shows that the record has been enhanced particularly at those points which bear witness to the uniqueness of Jesus, the present study will give an extended analysis of the more general materials before passing on to these materials, the former providing a basis for the interpretation of the latter. If in the general materials the essential content of Jesus' message and the essential nature of his mission can be defined apart from reference to his person or the time, then the particular materials which seem to depend on these two questions may perhaps be explained in the same way. Finally, in order to present a coherent, consistent picture of the historical Jesus this study will seek to find at each point the perspective of the actual ministry over against the perspective of the early church.¹ The perspective of the ministry is that of a man seeking to do God's will. Here the question of motive is particularly relevant. If Jesus offered his hearers a unique opportunity because of the time or because of his person, would not this introduce an ambivalence into his mission and message with regard to them?²

dependent upon Jesus' consciousness of his own uniqueness during his ministry; to say that Jesus saw in his own ministry the New Age or the Dawn of the Kingdom is tantamount to saying that he considered himself to be the Messiah, the fulfillment of Israel's hope. At any rate this has been the traditional argument; W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 66: "If Jesus saw the kingdom of God to be foreshadowed in his work, he cannot but, sooner or later, have thought of the Son of Man as foreshadowed in himself."

¹C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, revised (Glasgow: William Collins Sons, 1961), and others have successfully showed the need for rediscovering the original Sitz im Leben Jesu over against the setting of the early church with regard to the parables. This process is carried forward extensively in this study in other materials as well as the parables.

²Certainly the problem of rewards arises in the words of Jesus. According to the traditional interpretation of these sayings, Jesus spoke of the reward of heavenly treasure and the threat of judgment, both of which appeal to a basically selfish motive. As they are interpreted here, however, these sayings reveal the radical nature of Jesus' teaching, in which the motive is self-denial.

Similarly, if Jesus as a man claimed to be, or thought of himself as, the Messiah or the fulfillment of the end time, would not this introduce an ambivalence into his mission and message with regard to himself?¹

The present study thus seeks to take a position which is historically and theologically preferable to traditional interpretations of Jesus' life and ministry. The crux of this position is the fact of the resurrection, although the resurrection itself falls outside the scope of this study. The early church believed that Jesus was the Messiah and the fulfillment or inauguration of the *ἐσχατον*, and they naturally proclaimed, recited, and wrote down the events and sayings of Jesus' ministry in terms of this belief, but the belief itself was based on, above all, the resurrection of Jesus. Certainly the followers of Jesus had no real comprehension of, or faith in, Jesus as the Messiah before the resurrection.² Now the resurrection certainly does indicate that Jesus was the Messiah-Son of God and the fulfillment of God's will, but it does not necessarily indicate that he considered himself as such during his ministry.³ Moreover, although the Synoptic accounts of

¹This problem is usually not considered, because it is assumed—wrongly, we believe—that Jesus would not have had the outlook of an ordinary man. According to the traditional interpretation, Jesus thought of himself as the Messiah, not just a Jew, a rabbi, or even a prophet, proclaimed a kingdom which was in some sense his own, and went through suffering as a prelude or even means to the exalted glory of the apocalyptic Son of Man. According to the approach taken here, however, Jesus was a man of humble obedience who would not have made such claims or expected such rewards.

²If they had really believed in Jesus as the Messiah, they would not have run away in utter failure at the final test. After the resurrection, when they did believe, they endured persecution, suffering, and martyrdom many times over.

³This is an important distinction. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 8, and others argue that if we are to claim the same faith as the early church we must affirm the "Messianic consciousness" of Jesus and his self-designation by Messianic titles. The present study argues that with the early church we must affirm the Messiahship of Jesus on the basis of the resurrection but that there is no necessity to affirm the "Messianic consciousness" of Jesus.

the ministry of Jesus indicate that Jesus knew he was the Messiah-Son of God and that he sought to fulfill God's will, the former is, as we have already noted, historically problematical. The stable element, both from the viewpoint of historical criticism and from the viewpoint of theological necessity, is the fact that Jesus was a man who lived in obedience to God.

This study will, therefore, analyze the mission and motive of Jesus as they are revealed in the Synoptic materials critically considered. In the general materials which are treated first (Section A) it is evident that Jesus' ministry was wholly concerned with God's Rule, to which he sought to challenge men to respond in repentance, faith, and obedience. Therefore, by implication, Jesus' mission must be understood as response to God's Rule and obedience to God's will. In the subsequent treatment of the particular materials which deal more directly with Jesus himself (Section B), it becomes evident that even here Jesus did not think of his own uniqueness or the uniqueness of the time but simply sought to carry out God's will. Throughout these materials--the general and the particular--the essential nature of God's will in the understanding of Jesus, i.e. the essential nature of Jesus' mission, is best defined as self-denial and self-giving or, to be more concise, as love. Therefore the consistent picture of the historical Jesus which emerges is that of a man who gave himself completely in obedience to God's will. The life and death of Jesus reveal that love is the motive for mission and that the essential nature of mission is found in the concept of love.¹

¹What is meant by the terms, "mission," "motive," "love," will become evident in the discussion. Mission refers to purpose; it is God's Rule and will, to which men were called to respond and obey and to which Jesus

did respond and obey fully. In other words Jesus' mission is found in his understanding of obedience. Love refers to the inner and total response of the person, which is the essence of obedience and which was the essence of Jesus' mission. Here (even more than in Part I) we are not dependent on the use of the words for "love," since they are not used frequently in the Synoptic materials, but this is the best term to describe Jesus' understanding of obedience. The term ἀγάπη is, however, found at two strategic points in the general materials (Lk. 6:27-36/Mt. 5:39-48 and Mk. 12:28-34 par.), and, as we shall see, its use at these points is exactly parallel to Jesus' teachings elsewhere. Moreover, it is hardly to be expected that Jesus would say much about his love for others. The term "motive" refers to the relationship between mission and love; it is this inner and total response of the person in loving obedience.

A. THE MISSION AND MESSAGE OF JESUS (GENERAL):

It is evident in the Synoptic accounts that the mission and message of Jesus were focused upon the Kingdom of God.¹ Much study of the βασιλεία in relation to Jesus has centered upon the questions of eschatology and Christology, i.e. on the time question and the question of Jesus' Messianic consciousness. These may be important, but, as the following study will indicate, they should not be given a dominant position. Even if these questions can be decided with some certainty, it is still true to say that the first concern of Jesus' ministry was to proclaim and perform God's will—whether he thought of the Kingdom as present, inaugurated, or future and whether he considered himself to be the Messiah or not.

The following discussion analyzes the mission of Jesus in terms of his obedience to God's will. It is generally agreed that the primary meaning of the term ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is God's rule or reign,² although the secondary

¹K. L. Schmidt, et al., Basileia, trans. from TWNT by H. P. Kingdon (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957), p. 41: "In the Kingdom of God we are concerned with the entire preaching of Jesus Christ and his apostles." A. Richardson, "Kingdom of God," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. A. Richardson (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957), p. 119: "'The Kingdom of God' is the central theme of the teaching of Jesus, and it involves his whole understanding of his own person and work." Cf. A. M. Hunter, Introducing New Testament Theology (London: SCM Press, 1957), p. 13; J. Bright, The Kingdom of God (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), p. 17; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. I, trans. K. Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1952), p. 4; G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960), pp. 64-69.

²C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, revised (Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co., 1961), p. 29: "In sense, though not in grammatical form, the substantive conception in the phrase 'the Kingdom of God' is the idea of God, and the term 'kingdom' indicates that specific aspect, attribute, or activity of God in which he is revealed as King or Sovereign Lord of his people, or of the universe which he created." Cf. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 32; Richardson, op. cit., p. 119; T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: University Press, 1943), pp. 142-170; R. N. Flew, Jesus and his Church, 2nd ed. (London: Epworth Press, 1938), pp. 20-24; Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 67.

meaning, realm, is an important corollary.¹ It must also be agreed that what Jesus did and what he taught were closely related; his proclamation of the Kingdom of God and his performance of his mission were consistently parallel. Thus Jesus' ministry in general reveals his understanding of the will of God, and his understanding of the will of God reveals the nature of his mission.

More particularly the concern of this study is the motive of Jesus' mission. At first glance it appears as if this approach should be even more suspect than the Messianic-consciousness approach. It must be remembered, however, that the Old Testament prophets were deeply concerned with the heart response or motivation behind true obedience to God.² And later Judaism was not merely a religion of formal obedience, as is too often believed.³ So, too, the Gospel materials reveal that the question of motivation was an important issue in Jesus' dealings with his disciples and with his opponents; it arises in his ministry of preaching and healing among the people. A general study of these encounters will reflect light upon Jesus' own motivation and

¹T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 171: "The kingship of God has its manifestation on earth in the existence of a people whose King he is." V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959), p. 114: "While the Rule of God is the primary idea, that of a domain or community is also necessarily implied." Cf. Flew, op. cit., pp. 24-29.

²See Part I above.

³T. W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospel (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 32: "The Jewish ethic is just as much aware of the motives of conduct as we are." But this statement must be qualified. The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 307, 308: "The difference between the ethic of Jesus and that of Judaism is again simply this, that with Jesus the fact that the good heart is fundamental is accepted and carried to its logical conclusion while in Judaism the whole apparatus of Law and Tradition is still maintained beside the moral principle which renders it obsolete."

lead to a consideration of those passages which point more directly toward his mission and motive (Section B).

The source Mark is the logical starting point. It is particularly important for Jesus' encounter with the people because at this point the mighty deeds of Jesus will be considered. The sayings in Matthew and Luke are especially important, along with Mark, with regard to Jesus' encounter with the disciples. It was primarily to them that Jesus gave his teachings about the way of obedience. The encounter with the Pharisees will also utilize the two basic Synoptic sources. The other Gospel materials, including John, may also be referred to throughout, however. A careful analysis of the Synoptic materials into these three categories¹ is not necessary for this study because there is basic agreement in them all on the point at issue. Nevertheless these groups serve to give the same answer from different angles and to show its importance.

¹According to T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 17, "there are three distinct and readily distinguishable streams" in the teaching of Jesus. "Jesus has one way of dealing with the Scribes and Pharisees, another for the multitudes, and yet another for his intimate disciples."

1. Jesus and the People.

A convenient starting point is Jesus' encounter with the people. Here we are concerned with the historical fact and the theological interpretation of Jesus' mission in relation to the general Jewish population in first century Palestine. This encounter was inevitable because Jesus was a religious leader whose preaching and teaching gathered a hearing whether he was known as a scribe, a prophet, or a Messianic figure; it was a presupposition of his execution at the hands of the Jewish and Roman authorities. We are concerned here with the nature of Jesus' ministry and with the question of motivation. It is to be expected that these materials will not to the same degree explain the meaning of mission and motive as those concerned with the disciples and the Pharisees, but they do raise the problem.

It is impossible to doubt that Jesus' mission brought him into contact with the people and that his ministry included preaching and teaching, healings and exorcisms. A large segment of the Synoptic accounts is concerned with this general ministry of Jesus.¹ Mark's opening summary statement states that Jesus came into Galilee preaching about the Kingdom of God (Mk. 1:14, 15). Another important summary of Mark² describes Jesus' healing ministry and the great multitudes who came from outlying regions and pressed upon him (Mk. 3:7-12). Beside these and other general descriptions of the ministry³ there are numerous

¹Ibid., p. 28, gives the amounts of general teaching, according to the four source hypothesis, as follows: Mark—23.0%, Q—36.9%, M—8.4%, L—34.9%

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 85.

³Ibid., lists 47 summary statements in Mark, which either introduce or conclude groups of narratives or single narratives.

accounts of specific acts of healing and public teaching. Jesus' attraction of multitudes was a natural consequence of his marvelous works and words. The references to the multitudes ($\delta\chi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$) are numerous¹ and are not mere invention, although allowance must be made for hyperbole. Jesus dealt with large crowds and smaller groups and individuals as he appeared in the Synagogues and about the countryside and in homes. Out of these crowds some became disciples.

An important characteristic of Jesus' ministry among the people—the one which is especially relevant to the topic—is that it brought help to the needy. Jesus' preaching about the Kingdom was Good News,² and it showed that God's Rule was one of love and forgiveness.³ A major part of Jesus' ministry was the healing of the sick and the deliverance of the possessed from demons.⁴ Although the accounts show Jesus in the company of all elements of Jewish society, it is clear that he had particular concern for the outcast and down-trodden, the poor and the despised, the weak and the helpless. He was at times

¹Matthew has 42, Mark 15, Luke 12. Some of these references are editorial, but others are an integral part of the materials.

²It appears from the Gospel records that Jesus himself first used the expression ($\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$, $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$) of his own proclamation and that its background was Isaianic (Is. 40:9, 41:27, 52:7, 60:6, 61:1; cf. Nah. 1:15, Ps. 40:9). J. W. Bowman, "The Term Gospel and its Cognates in the Palestinian Syriac," New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: University Press, 1959), p. 58; A. Richardson, "Gospel," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, p. 100.

³E. g. the parables of the Lost Sheep, Lost Coin, and Prodigal Son. Cf. Dodd, op. cit., pp. 89, 90; J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke (London: SCM Press, 1958), pp. 99-120.

⁴C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 82: "The importance of the miracles for Mark is indicated by the fact that 47% of the verses of the first ten chapters deal directly or indirectly with them." Taylor, op. cit., p. 80, lists 17 miracle stories, 12 of which are healings and exorcisms.

surrounded by the sick and maimed; he was confronted by the unclean¹; he sat and ate with the despised publicans; he called the children to himself. Whether or not they were actually quoted by Jesus, the prophecies of Isaiah did aptly describe his ministry: "The blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them."²

In summary we can say that Jesus' mission involved an encounter with the Jewish people in which he ministered to their needs. This is one aspect of his mission as obedience to God's will; it is one significant way in which the Rule of God was expressed in his life. Our main concern now is to discover any clues to Jesus' motives as he dealt with the people and their motivation in response to him. The latter will augment the former.

It might be argued that the Gospels state Jesus' motives during his ministry; in any case there are many references to his compassion and pity. In the narrative introducing the feeding of the 5000 Mark says that Jesus had

¹It is interesting to note that Jesus never shrank from contact with the unclean and the resultant defilement to his own person. The adulterous were unclean (Lev. 18), but he talked with the Samaritan woman (Jn. 4:7-42) and defended the woman taken in adultery (Jn. 7:53-8:11). Contact with lepers was forbidden (Lev. 13, 14), but he touched and healed at least one leper (Mk. 1:40-45). Dead bodies defiled (Num. 19), but Jesus touched the bier of the widow's son at Nain (Lk. 7:11-17) and took the hand of Jairus' daughter when he raised her (Mk. 5:21-24, 35-43). Issues from the body conveyed uncleanness (Lev. 15), but the woman with a flow touched Jesus' clothes, and he commended her faith (Mk. 5:25-34). K. Grayston, "Unclean," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, p. 272. A Richardson, The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels (London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 62, overstates the use of these miracle-stories "to convey spiritual teaching concerning salvation" and the symbolic interpretation of these details.

²Mt. 11:5/Lk. 7:22, cf. Is. 29:18, 19, 35:5, 6, 61:1; also Lk. 4:18, 19, cf. Is. 61:1, 2.

compassion (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη)¹ on the multitude because they were like sheep without a shepherd (Mk. 6:34). At the feeding of the 4000 Jesus is made to say: "I have compassion on the crowd," but this time the reason given is his concern for their hunger (Mk. 8:2). Jesus was moved with compassion when he saw the widow of Nain weeping for her son, and he restored him to her (Lk. 7:13). After healing the Gerasene demoniac Jesus sent him home "to tell how much the Lord has done and how he has had mercy (ἐλείησεν) on you." (Mk. 5:19)² In other instances it was the ones in need to whose request for compassion or mercy Jesus responded. The father of the epileptic boy said: "If you can do anything, have pity (σπλαγχνίσθεις) on us and help us." (Mk. 9:22) Blind Bartimaeus cried out: "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy (ἐλείησόν) on me!" (Mk. 10:46) When the rich man came to ask about eternal life, Jesus loved (ἠγάπησεν) him and showed him what he should do (Mk. 10:21). Even the Gospel of John, which seems to avoid any reference to Jesus' compassion because of its use of miracles as signs, contains the moving passage (at the raising of Lazarus): "He was deeply moved in spirit and troubled.... Jesus wept. So the Jews said, 'See how he loved him!'" (Jn. 11:33-36)

¹Although the anatomical reference is different, the meaning corresponds to our usage of the inner source of emotions and actions in the heart. The noun (σπλαγχνισμός), which is used mostly in the plural refers both to the literal entrails and the figurative seat of the emotions. From the bowels proceed affection and sympathy, pity and compassion, love. Mercy (ἐλεος) is a synonym which does not to the same extent express the inwardness of feeling. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), pp. 770, 249.

²Jesus' feeling in the situation is not mitigated by his reference to the Lord's (meaning God's) mercy. The fact that he was performing the cure as God's instrument implies that he also felt compassion as he told of God's compassion.

These references suggest that Jesus experienced the same feelings generally as he ministered to the people, both the masses and individuals, in their need.¹ It is clear then that his anger when confronted by the leper in Mk. 1:40-45² could not possibly have been directed at the man for intruding but on the contrary was expressive of his genuine concern for the man. Anger at the sight of the Satanic working of the disease in the man's body was a natural corollary of his compassion. In the same way Jesus rebuked the demons (Mk. 9:25) and delivered those possessed by them. So also must we interpret the pronouncement of woes against the cities of Galilee, not as condemnation but pain and compassion (Mt. 11:20-24/Lk. 10:13-15).³ This same compassion of Jesus for the people is seen right up to the end. When he came finally to Jerusalem, he expressed

¹The presentation of these miracles as the breaking in of the power of God and as signs of the Messianic Age must not be allowed to obscure this note, which is a dominant motif in the Synoptics. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 85: "To belittle their significance as the response of Christ's compassion to particular need is to give a seriously wrong impression." Richardson, The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels, p. 31, states that the Synoptists and St. John were not interested in "the motive of compassion" but in the evidence of the miracles as to who Jesus is. He thus plays down this motif (and the evidence). But if the Gospel writers were not interested in this point, these references are all the more significant because of their historical priority.

²Read ὀργισθεῖς instead of σπλαγχνισθεῖς against Nestle, the British and Foreign Bible Society text, and Souter. The MSS are divided (though in favor of σπλαγχνισθεῖς) and the Matthean and Lukan parallels have neither. The decisive argument is that σπλαγχνισθεῖς can easily be explained as an insertion to replace the difficult reading ὀργισθεῖς, but not vice versa. Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 187; Cranfield, op. cit., p. 92; Richardson, The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels, p. 33; R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), pp. 25, 26.

³Ὀὐαί would better be translated "alas" here. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1949), p. 77; Arndt and Gingrich, op. cit., p. 595. C. J. Cadoux, The Historic Mission of Jesus (London: Lutterworth Press, 1941), p. 191, speaks of "Jesus' lamentation over those Galilean towns which did not repent."

his compassion over the city and for the nation it represented: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem.... How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not!" (Mt. 23:37/Lk. 13:34) Jesus wept over the city because of its present disobedience and coming tragedy (Lk. 19:41-44). Even when he was being led away to be crucified, he turned back the pity of the women of Jerusalem upon themselves (Lk. 23:27-31). Jesus' love and compassion for his people was part of his entire ministry and of his death.

Surely all these passages give some insight into Jesus' mission and motive. He was moved with compassion as he brought help to those in need.¹ Even if this should be considered his emotional reaction in the situation--and it would be incorrect just to treat this psychologically and in modern, analytical terms--it points to a deeper motivation. For Jesus was proclaiming the Rule of God as the Good News of his grace, and he was bringing deliverance from the powers of evil and the rule of Satan. At that time there could have been no consideration of his compassion as mere sentiment or of his healings as merely mental or even mental and physical. The fact that in the process of this ministry, or rather in its completion, Jesus gave his life also points to the meaning of his mission and the nature and depth of his motivation.

The next consideration is the motivation of the people in their encounter with Jesus. The validity of this inquiry is seen throughout. Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom was a call to repentance; his teaching

¹W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1944), p. 50: "The message of Jesus [as well as his acts], so far from invoking a negation of all humanitarian sentiment in religion, had its deep roots in compassion for men and developed side by side with it."

was not understood by the people because of their hard-heartedness; his healings evoked faith; and his public ministry included a call to discipleship.

1.) "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe the gospel.'" (Mk. 1:14) With these words Mark describes the opening of Jesus' public ministry and the content of his message. When Jesus sent out the twelve, they too "preached that men should repent." (Mk. 6:12) Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God was a call to repentance¹; this means that it challenged the hearts of the people. Jesus and John the Baptist stand in the prophetic line in their use of *μετάνοια* *μετάνοια*; its meaning is found in the Old Testament term *נָחַם*.² Repentance involves the turning and response of the whole being to God in obedience and trust, the turning away from evil and from all other loyalties. It is a religio-ethical conversion that goes to the source or motive of action. The fruit of repentance is new conduct which springs from a transformed heart (Mt. 3:8/Lk. 3:8). That this was an essential element in Jesus' mission is obvious not only in his encounter with the people, but also in relation to the disciples, who left everything to seek the Kingdom and follow Jesus, and the Pharisees, who would not repent

¹Mt. 11:20, 21/Lk. 10:13, Mt. 12:41/Lk. 11:32, Lk. 15:7, 10, 24:47. In Mk. 2:17/Mt. 9:13/Lk. 5:32 Luke interprets aright when he adds the last two words to the saying of Jesus: "I have come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 207: "On the whole, it is best to conclude that Jesus is speaking of the call to repentance."

²Cranfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-46; Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 154, 155; J. W. Bowman, *The Intention of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943), pp. 29-32. A. Richardson, "Repent," *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, pp. 191, 192: "In the New Testament the prophetic requirement that repentance should be sincere is deepened and made a sine qua non of entry into the Kingdom of God in the teaching of our Lord."

(Mt. 21:32—οὐδὲ μετεμελήθητε, cf. Lk. 7:29, 30) but sought to destroy Jesus.

2.) Jesus' challenge to the heart is also basic to his public teaching; it is found in the difficult passage Mark 4:11, 12. Literary analysis of Mk. 4 isolates these two verses as a Markan insertion into the context of the parable of the Sower and its later allegorical interpretation, between the question of the disciples in v. 10 and Jesus' reply in v. 13.¹ The saying in vs. 11, 12 must therefore be interpreted apart from the context, although it can still be considered authentic.² Mark entered the logion here because of the word παραβολαίς, but the underlying Hebrew and Aramaic can mean "riddles" and apply more generally to Jesus' spoken ministry.³ With this

¹Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 11, 12: "V. 11f. is a logion belonging to a wholly independent tradition, which was adapted by Mark to the word παραβολαί (vs. 10, 11), and must therefore be interpreted without reference to its present context." Cf. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 255, 256.

²The principal argument in favor of its authenticity is its correspondence with the Palestinian Targum over against the Hebrew and LXX, which speaks for its Palestinian origin. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 77, 78; Taylor, op. cit., p. 257; Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 12, 13.

³Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 13, 14, states that this is "the usual meaning" and that the antithesis here "requires" this interpretation. Cf. R. Otto, The Kingdom of God, trans. F. V. Filson and B. Lee-Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), pp. 141-143; Taylor, op. cit., p. 256. The parable itself was a common form of teaching, and its purpose was not to obscure but to clarify. B. H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937), p. 78: "A parable, no matter in what form it be, is to illustrate and make clear the thought, and Jesus' parables do this to a remarkable degree." Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 69: "Jesus' parables aim, as all parables do, at making things clear." Therefore this use of the word "parable" does not provide the necessary antithesis in Mk. 4:11, 12. Furthermore, why would Jesus bother to give veiled esoteric teaching in public when he could teach his disciples unambiguously in private? A third meaning of the term "parable," which is neither "riddle" nor pictorial explanation, appears in Hermas: "an enigmatic presentation that is something seen in a vision, something expressed in words, but in any case is in need of detailed interpretation." Arndt and Gingrich, op. cit., p. 618. This last use is esoteric and veiled; it does not apply to the teaching of Jesus. Surely we must not undo the valuable, recent work on the parables of Jesus and return to allegorical interpretations.

translation the antithetic parallel is complete. The secret of the Kingdom is given (or is revealed) to the disciples; everything comes in riddles (or is hidden) to those who are outside. The contrast, which lies in the openness of the *μυστήριον*¹ to the followers of Jesus and its hiddenness to the outsiders, is explained by the "infamous" *ἵνα* clause, which quotes parts of Is. 6:9, 10. In the latter passage it is clear that the failure to understand is explained as due to the hard-heartedness of the people. They see and hear, and yet they are blind and deaf--because they will not turn and receive forgiveness.² It appears as if Jesus saw that his own situation was similar to Isaiah's and made this reference. If the teleological framework in Mark (*ἵνα...μήποτε*) goes back to Jesus, the *ἵνα* can be taken as an abbreviation of *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* and the *μήποτε* as "unless," following the Targum *dilemma*.³ In this way Jesus would be explaining that it was God's will that the mystery of the Kingdom be revealed only on the basis of repentance and faith, of which hardness of heart is the direct antithesis. There was no ambiguity in God's gracious Rule as Jesus presented it (it "is given"), but there were antithetic

¹Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 255: "In the New Testament, and especially in the Pauline Epistles, it means an 'open secret' made known by God.... There is no case in which it connotes secret rites or esoteric knowledge communicated to 'initiates.'" Cf. Jn. 18:19, 20, where Jesus testifies before the High Priest on this question of his teaching and his disciples: "I have spoken openly to the world...I have said nothing secretly."

²*Ibid.*, p. 256: Is. 6:9, 10 "in the form of a command ironically describes what in fact would be the result of Isaiah's ministry." "This use of a command to express a result is typically Semitic."

³Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 15. According to M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), pp. 153-158, however, the harshness of the saying was a deliberate work of Mark and cannot be eased merely by reference to the underlying Aramaic.

responses to the challenge, which were rooted in the heart.¹

It is quite possible that Mark, on the other hand, inserted the logion at this point in his narrative in order to explain the obscurity of the parables according to a theological belief of the early church, i.e. in the providence of God the Jews were hardened so that the Gentiles might be saved.² It is, however, impossible to reconcile this interpretation, which, it must be admitted, is the plain meaning of the syntax as it stands, with Jesus' ministry as a whole. "That [Jesus] desired not to be understood by the people in general and therefore clothed his teaching in unintelligible forms cannot be made credible on any reasonable reading of the Gospels."³ If, however, the original use of the logion as explained above is accepted, it fits not only the Synoptic presentation of Jesus' public ministry, but also

¹Cranfield, op. cit., pp. 156-158, discusses this passage in terms of the "Messianic Secret," interpreting it in terms of Jesus' person: "This secret of the Kingdom of God is the secret of Jesus' Messiahship and the secret of his divine Sonship." Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 13, 16, relates it to the time question: "The one 'secret of the Kingdom of God' [is] the secret of its contemporary irruption in the word and work of Jesus." But we must rather interpret the saying in terms of Jesus' mission, which is obviously the original Sitz im Leben. Nothing in the passage itself warrants its application to Jesus' person or his eschatology, which implies a veiledness in Jesus' mission. On the contrary the hiddenness lies in the hearers who refuse to understand and turn; the mystery is given openly.

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 257; Black, op. cit., p. 156.

³Dodd, op. cit., p. 15, and others consider the saying to be unauthentic on this basis. P. Carrington, According to Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1960), pp. 103-106, maintains, however, that this may be left as a hard, paradoxical, Hebraic ("the Hebrew tradition is full of this sort of thing") saying from Jesus and still refer to "the spiritual and mental condition of such persons, not the intention of Jesus in speaking in parables." It is even cogent, on this basis, to argue that Mark also understood the saying in this sense, for in both the parable of the Sower, which precedes it, and in the later interpretation, which follows, the sower and the seed are non-discriminatory and no failure to produce is attributed to them.

his encounter with the disciples and with the Pharisees. Jesus' teaching—as his entire ministry—was a challenge to the hearts of his followers; without a basic inward change there could be no understanding and no obedience.

3.) The idea of motive is also found in Jesus' healing ministry in the concept of faith. The account of the paralytic (Mk. 2:1-12) draws attention to the faith of the four carriers and presumably that of the invalid also.¹ The woman with a flow of blood, apparently like many other sick people who came to Jesus, thought that if she could even touch his garments she would become well. When this did in fact happen, Jesus said, "Your faith has made you well." He said the same thing to Bartimaeus, who received his sight and followed Jesus (Mk. 10:52). When the household of Jairus gave up hope because they thought his child was already dead, Jesus exhorted, "Do not fear, only believe." (Mk. 5:35, 36) In the case of the dumb spirit (Mt. 9:14-29) Jesus answered the inability of his disciples to heal with the expression: "O faithless generation," and he replied to the doubting query of the father emphatically: "All things are possible to him who believes." The father cried out, "I believe; help my unbelief!" When the Centurion came to Jesus on behalf of his servant, Jesus marveled at his faith, commended him for it, and said, "Go; be it done for you as you have believed." (Mt. 8:5-13/Lk. 7:1-12)² On the other hand, when Jesus came to Nazareth, his lack or paucity of mighty works was linked to the unbelief of the people (Mk. 6:5, 6). It is evident

¹Taylor, op. cit., p. 194.

²Cf. Mk. 7:24-30/Mt. 15:21-28. In Matthew's account Jesus says to the Canaanite woman, "O woman, great is your faith! Be it done for you as you desire."

from these instances that an essential factor in Jesus' healing ministry was faith, not only Jesus' faith, but also the faith of the people concerned.¹ The object of faith for Jesus and for them--as for all Jews--was God.² This faith in God which Jesus had and which he evoked from people was the inner response of trust.³ It is not separate from repentance; the woes on the cities of Galilee were spoken because the mighty works were done in their midst and they did not repent (Mt. 11:20-24/Lk. 10:13-15). And the locus of faith, like repentance, is the heart (Mk. 11:23). Therefore we find the same inward challenge in the healing ministry of Jesus that we found in his

¹T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 213: "It would seem that the normal picture of a healing miracle presents it as an act of co-operation between Jesus and the patient, a confluence of love and faith."

²Cf. Mk. 11:22: Jesus tells his disciples, "Have faith in God." Cranfield, op. cit., pp. 83-85, and Richardson, The Miracle-Stories of The Gospels, passim, speak of a veiled self-revelation of God in Jesus, particularly in his miracles, which implies that Jesus wanted people to believe in him as the Messianic object of faith, not just as God's instrument. According to R. Bultmann (and A. Weiser), Faith, trans. from TWNT by D. M. Barton (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1961), p. 63, however, it is only in the Johannine Gospel that faith was directed specifically toward Jesus and his word. Considering the New Testament materials as a whole, it is best to assume that Jesus directed the faith of others, as he directed his own faith (even in St. John), toward God and that in the early church faith in God (rightly) became identified with faith in the risen Christ. Although this development was bound to affect the Synoptic accounts (obviously less than John) there is not sufficient evidence to state that Jesus called for a new orientation of faith toward himself during his early ministry. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 37: "We may say with some confidence that to St. Mark and his readers these mighty acts of benevolence are certainly evidences of the Lord's Messiahship; but the evangelist is careful to make clear that they were not thus regarded at the time when they were actually performed."

³Bultmann, Faith, pp. 64, 65: "In general 'faith' in the synoptists denotes trust in the miraculous help of God, indeed in one's own power to perform miracles."

preaching and teaching.

4.) That Jesus intended to bring about a deep change in those who came to him is also found in his call to discipleship, which rose directly out of his public ministry. Besides the calling of the Twelve (which will be considered later) there are several passages which suggest the nature of this challenge. The story of the so-called Rich Young Ruler (a young man in Matthew, a ruler in Luke, neither in Mark) indicates the depth of Jesus' challenge (Mk. 10:17-22/Mt. 19:16-22/Lk. 18:18-23). This man ran eagerly up to Jesus to ask, "Good Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?"¹ Jesus directed the man's attention toward God by referring to the word "good" and to the Commandments. When the rich man stated that he had kept the Commandments, Jesus went to the crux of the matter with a particular, concrete demand; he must give away his riches and follow Jesus. The rich man, like Jesus, was serious about doing God's will, and both, like all Jews, found God's will expressed in the Commandments. But the contrast between Jesus and the rich man was so great that although Jesus loved him he could not accept his way and although the rich man was at first eager to follow he went away disappointed. What is the significance of the one thing lacking? Obviously it was not something beyond or above the law, yet without it the keeping of the law was entirely inadequate. Nor was the problem possessions as such. The rich man's wealth was the symptom of his problem, and the call to give it up was a challenge to redirect his life expressed in concrete,

¹Cranfield, *op. cit.*, p. 327, says that the man at least asked the right question. It can, on the contrary, be considered the exact opposite. What is the difference between holding onto an earthly inheritance and seeking a heavenly one? That they are the same in being self-centered is certainly true in this case.

relevant terms. The man's response indicated that he would not follow Jesus because his possessions, his life, and even his keeping of the Commandments were wrongly oriented--toward himself. When Jesus told him to give away his possessions, he was asking him to give himself--to God and to the poor. This is the true keeping of the Commandments¹; this is Jesus' understanding of obedience to God; this is the meaning of his call, "follow me."

A similar story with a different ending is the encounter between Jesus and Zacchaeus (Lk. 19:1-10). Zacchaeus was also a rich man, and because he was a chief tax collector we can assume that he collaborated with the Romans and stole from his own people for personal gain. But before Jesus' visit was over Zacchaeus reversed the direction of his life from taking to giving: "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have defrauded anyone of anything, I restore it fourfold." In contrast to the other rich man Zacchaeus was saved: "Today salvation has come to this house." He had made the inner--and outward--response of obedience which Jesus demanded.

Another passage in which Jesus presented his challenge to those who followed is Mt. 8:19-22/Lk. 9:57-62. Here Jesus' "follow me" is a serious demand to count the cost, presented to would-be disciples in terms of the homelessness of the Son of Man, the leaving of the dead to bury their own dead, and the plowman in the field. The call of the Kingdom of God which Jesus presents to his disciples permits no turning back.² "Jesus assumes

¹Ibid., p. 330: "The one thing lacking is the all-important thing, a single-hearted devotion to God, obedience to the first of the Ten Commandments." The man's possessions can be considered an idol, a breaking of this basic commandment.

²This turning or looking back might be considered the antithesis of repentance, which is turning to God with the whole heart and life.

on the part of his followers a readiness to make a complete surrender."¹

One further example of Jesus' call to discipleship is found in Mt. 11:28-30: "Come to me, all.... Take my yoke upon you...."² With this wide open invitation Jesus offered and challenged all men to take on themselves the yoke of the Kingdom of God. In his understanding God's Rule called forth a response of obedience to His will,³ and he sought to enlist others to follow him in the way of obedience: "Learn from me." And once again we find the element of inner disposition or motive in responding to that will: "For I am gentle and lowly in heart." This call, which is a challenge to give, to redirect the life, and to surrender to God's Rule in obedience to his will, coincides with and completes Jesus' call to repentance and faith, and it is evident throughout that this challenge goes to the heart.⁴

Passing reference must be made to one further problem which arises in Jesus' public ministry, the so-called Messianic Secret. This question

¹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 137. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 73: "Those, therefore, who would attach themselves to Jesus must count the cost of their allegiance; they must be prepared to endure hardship; they must be willing to sacrifice their own feelings; they must give absolute priority to the work of the Kingdom and give themselves to it with perfect singleness of purpose."

²The similarity of this saying with certain wisdom sayings is no adequate reason to dispute its authenticity. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 186.

³Ibid. "To take upon oneself the yoke of the Kingdom is to accept the sovereignty of God and to give oneself to his service."

⁴This challenge to discipleship and such basic references as Mk. 8:34-36 will be taken up in a more comprehensive manner below.

concerns much of the Synoptic materials,¹ and it is important for our understanding of Jesus' mission. In many of the miracle stories Jesus silenced the acclamation of the demons or enjoined the cured to secrecy.² These references lend themselves to a concentration of attention upon Jesus' person.³ But there are some passages in which it appears as if it was Jesus' obedience to the will of God (his mission) and his endeavor to get others to take up this same obedience (their mission) that led him to discourage popular attention to himself. When he was told on one occasion, following some healings, that everyone was looking for him, he pressed on to the next towns to

¹ Taylor, op. cit., p. 123: "The Messianic Secret lies behind almost every narrative in Mark." It must be admitted, however, with T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," p. 212, that there is no a priori necessity to interpret all passages normally grouped under this heading in the same way or by the same principle.

² Mk. 1:25/Lk. 4:35, Mk. 1:34/Lk. 4:41, Mk. 1:42-44/Mt. 8:4/Lk. 5:14, Mt. 9:30, Mk. 3:12/Mt. 12:16, Mk. 5:43/Lk. 8:56, Mk. 7:36, Mk. 8:26. According to T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," p. 212, citing M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, 2nd ed., pp. 69, 70, three of these commands of silence (Mk. 5:43, 7:36, 8:26) refer to the means rather than the fact of the cure, which would lessen their significance in the argument concerning Jesus' person.

³ The question of the Messianic Secret and the Messianic Consciousness approach will be considered further in Section B. The method of approach used here is to stay strictly on the question of Jesus' mission, which is less problematical and--we believe--more significant as well as more in keeping with the Sitz im Leben Jesu over against the early church. Jesus was concerned with obedience to God's will both in himself and in others; the early church, Mark specifically, was concerned particularly with Jesus' identity or person. It is quite possible that this bias affected the Synoptic traditions and editions in such a way as to mislead later investigation into the "Messianic Secret." This is not by any means to say that Jesus was not the Messiah; nor is it to say that the early church was wrong in stressing, on the basis of the resurrection, that Jesus was God's Son and Messiah. It is merely, in keeping with the adopted method, to take a position which is historically (because of the evidence in the Synoptics) and theologically (because of the nature of Jesus' mission and message) more basic.

carry on his preaching: "For that is why I came out." (Mk. 1:35-38) The Gospel of John interprets the withdrawal of Jesus after feeding the multitude in the wilderness as a deliberate avoidance of popular demand to make him king (Jn. 6:15, cf. Mk. 6:45-52, 8:10).¹ Luke records an incident in which Jesus answered a woman's flattery with a demand for obedience to God's will (Lk. 11:27, 28). The same theme is found in Jesus' response to his family in Mk. 3:34: "Whoever does the will of God is my brother, and sister, and mother," and it occurs at Mt. 7:21/Lk. 6:46: "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the Kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven." One important element in the "Messianic Secret" which is evident here is that Jesus was not just attracting men to himself and that he was not just ministering to their needs. The Synoptic accounts as a whole show that Jesus rejected the popular, outward response to his mission and message and that the people soon rejected him. The fact that he rejected this popularity while at the same time calling men to discipleship points again to his basic challenge to the hearts and lives of men. Jesus' purpose in his public ministry was to bring about a decisive response to God's Rule. The purity of his motives and the impurity of theirs lay behind the so-called Messianic Secret.²

The first conclusion that arises from this last discussion and from

¹V. Taylor, The Life and Ministry of Jesus (London: Macmillan & Co., 1954), p. 123: "Although Mark does not make this statement his account is fully in harmony with it."

²This conclusion agrees exactly with the discussion of Mk. 4:11, 12 above. Jesus made an open challenge to all men to respond with him to God's Rule. The veil or secret or misunderstanding with regard to his mission as well as his message was only in their willful, hard-hearted rejection of God's will as Jesus presented it. (On the injunctions to secrecy and the "Messianic Secret" see further pp. 212-217, 234-238 below.)

this study of Jesus' public ministry as a whole is that to find the full meaning and motive of Jesus' mission we must go on to consider his dealings with the disciples. To those who responded to his call Jesus taught the way of obedience. Only on the basis of repentance and faith could Jesus' teachings be understood.

But there are other, significant, positive conclusions. We have seen that throughout his public ministry Jesus presented a challenge to the people--in his preaching with its call to repentance and faith, in his teaching with its challenge to the hard-hearted, in his healings and exorcisms with their evocation of faith, and in his "follow me" with its call to committed discipleship. This challenge was inner, involving the heart, and it was total, encompassing the whole life. And what Jesus challenged the people to do and be he did and was himself. His compassion, which was found in all his ministry, was not mere sentiment but the expression of a life given in mission--to God and to men.

2. Jesus and the Disciples.

This study of Jesus' encounter with his disciples arises from and assumes the background of the previous study. It can be assumed, for instance, that Jesus loved his disciples¹ and that he led them to disciplined obedience through repentance and faith.² Our purpose here is not to attempt to separate and dissect carefully all the materials on Jesus' dealings with the disciples, but to see the essential nature of his way of obedience as he taught it to them. It is important to remember that the method of approach is to concentrate on mission both for Jesus himself and for his followers in response to God's Rule, i.e. to avoid specifically the questions of Christology (Jesus' person) and eschatology (time), which seem to precondition exegesis. As could be expected, the materials on discipleship best reveal the meaning and motive of mission—with regard to the disciples directly and with regard to Jesus himself indirectly. The challenge which Jesus presented to these followers is the same inner and total challenge which he presented in the public ministry, but it is here laid out more clearly and completely. The Synoptics contain much material on Jesus' relationship with and

¹ An extreme example of Jesus' feeling for his disciples is his "Woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed" (Mk. 14:21), which "is not a curse, but a cry of sorrow and of anguish" for Judas. V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959), p. 542. Cf. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. A. Ehrhardt (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 153.

² See above, pp. 92-94. G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960), p. 147: "What he demands from them does not in fact differ from what he asks of everybody: to repent in light of the coming Kingdom of God."

teaching to the disciples,¹ and these are primarily concerned with God's Rule and will.

There is no reason to question the fact that Jesus had disciples,² although difficulties do arise regarding their names, delineations, and exact roles.³ At least the Synoptic accounts make clear that Jesus' "follow me" resulted in men becoming his disciples. In Mk. 1:12 he called Simon and Andrew (δεῦτε ὁπίσω μου), in Mk. 1:19 he called James and John, and in Mk. 2:14 he called Levi (ἀκολουθεῖ μοι),⁴ and they followed him. In Mk. 3:13, 14 we read that he "called to him those whom he desired" and "appointed twelve." In Mk. 8:34 he called the multitude with his disciples and said, "If any man would come after me, let him...follow me." We have already seen this general call to discipleship in Mt. 8:19-22/Lk. 9:57-62 and Mt. 11:28-30 and noted that it was the logical result of the public ministry as a whole. The disciples were obviously a major factor in Jesus' mission.

The characteristic of Jesus' call to discipleship which is of first importance here is that it was a call to follow him in obedience to God.

¹T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: University Press, 1943), p. 28, gives the amounts of teaching directed to the disciples as follows: Mark—53.5%, Q—52.4%, M—66.3%, L—26.6%.

²E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 11: "There can be no doubt about the fact that Jesus called disciples to follow him."

³For instance, it is difficult to determine the exact relationship between the Twelve, the other disciples, and the crowd or to define the discipleship instituted by Jesus over against that of the scribes, John the Baptist, and the Jewish sects.

⁴Taylor, op. cit., p. 169: "In all the Gospels ἀκολουθεῖω is used freely, sometimes absolutely, but generally with the dative, to describe attachment to the person of Jesus, personal surrender to his summons, and acceptance of his leadership."

It is evident throughout the Synoptics that God is the object of Jesus' and his disciples' obedience. It must be remembered first of all that the call is issued under the over-all theme of the Kingdom or Rule of God.¹ Thus Jesus told his followers, "Whoever receives me, receives not me but him who sent me." (Mk. 9:37, cf. Mt. 10:40/Lk. 10:16) He told them to "seek first God's Kingdom" (Mt. 6:33/Lk. 12:31), i.e. "to make the doing of His will the supreme aim."² He taught them to pray: "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." (Mt. 6:9, 10; Lk. 11:2 has, "Father, hallowed be thy name. Thy Kingdom come.") It is the Father in heaven who is addressed in prayer; it is his name that is blessed; his Kingdom is coming; his will must be done on earth.³ The Sermon on the Mount and other teachings are concerned with God's will which the disciples are to obey. Nowhere is there any hint that Jesus would disrupt the monotheism of his people; on the contrary he confessed with the Shema that there is but one God (Mk. 12:29). It is God alone who is to be served (Mt. 6:24/Lk. 16:13). It is equally clear, however, that this obedience to God which Jesus called for normally

¹Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 148: "The Kingdom of God is the sole foundation of Jesus' call to follow him."

²C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, revised (Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co., 1961), p. 35.

³Much has been made of the filial consciousness of Jesus in his unique use of abba and of the eschatological significance of the two phrases, "thy Kingdom come, thy will be done." But in this prayer, as in Jesus' prayer at Gethsemane (Mk. 14:36), an important element is the human response to God's will, i.e. obedience. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1949), p. 169: "There is a sense in which the Kingdom comes whenever and wherever God's will is acknowledged and obeyed on earth. And the prayer, if it is to be sincerely prayed, must have a reference to him who prays it."

took the form of following Jesus.¹ He commanded or exhorted: "Follow me!" The disciples literally followed Jesus about the countryside, probably in everything he did--this is included in the verb "to follow" and in the vocation of a disciple.² But far more is meant here. The disciples were called to take Jesus' yoke and learn from him (Mt. 11:29).³ He explained the will of God to them.⁴ They were to do as their master and teacher (Mt. 10:24, 25a/Lk. 6:40). Those who obeyed God's will he called his brethren (Mk. 3:35). He shared not only his understanding of God's will

¹The saying, "For he that is not against us is for us" (Mk. 9:40/Lk. 9:50), suggests that obedience to God was not bound up exclusively with allegiance to Jesus. The saying, "He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters" (Mt. 12:30/Lk. 11:30), appears to be, but is not necessarily, contradictory. If Jesus was really concerned with obedience to God, both statements can be true. Jesus called unconditionally for response in obedience to God; anyone who refused to obey God was opposed to Jesus. In his ministry Jesus left many people behind without excluding them from God's Rule. It is only with the introduction of the question of Jesus' person that problems arise. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 87; Taylor, op. cit., p. 408; Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 209.

²Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 146: Discipleship "consists, in actual fact, in the determination to abandon everything and, in the first instance quite literally, to follow Jesus from place to place and to accept the fate of the wanderer with all its privations." Cf. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), p. 30.

³J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke (London: SCM Press, 1958), p. 136: "The yoke is not an additional burden, but a device intended to lighten the burden by adjustment and distribution of the weight. To take up the yoke of Jesus means actually becoming one of his followers."

⁴E.g. in Mt. 5:17-48 Jesus expounds the law and the prophets, about which he says, "I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them." His "but I say unto you" with regard to certain laws need not be taken as self-revelation or authoritative pronouncement. Jesus was pointing out the real purpose of the laws and calling for real obedience to God. Cf. F. C. Grant, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1960), p. 140. (On Mt. 5:17 see further p. 232 below.)

but the actual way of obedience which he took,¹ i.e. his mission: "The cup that I drink you will drink; and with the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be baptized." (Mk. 10:39) Jesus thus led them to Jerusalem (Mk. 10:32-34) and the cross. The disciples were called by Jesus to join him in response to God's Rule, i.e. in obedience to God's will.

The other important characteristic of discipleship, which is implied in the former and which suggests its particular meaning as developed below, is the abandonment of all things. When Simon and Andrew were called, they left² their nets. James and John left their father and the hired men in the boat. Levi presumably left the tax office (Mk. 2:14/Mt. 9:9/Lk. 5:28—Luke says "he left everything"). Peter said at one point, speaking for the Twelve, "Lo, we have left everything and followed you." (Mk. 10:28)³ "Following Jesus entails severing old ties."⁴ But this leaving all was not just a natural corollary of discipleship; it was a direct command of

¹The Gospel of John works out extensively this whole matter of Jesus' obedience to God and the disciples' obedience to God as followers of Jesus. It tends, of course, to identify Jesus and God because following Jesus is the way of obedience to God—and because of the Christological concern of the Gospel. Schweizer, op. cit., p. 68: "The picture of Christ in the Fourth Gospel is entirely determined by the idea of obedience."

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 169: "ἀφίημι is frequently used in Mark in the sense of 'leave,' 'abandon,' some 15 times in all."

³The absoluteness of the response is by no means as sure as the absoluteness of the demand. That this saying contains "a characteristic touch of exaggeration" is suggested by references to the boat (Mk. 3:9, 4:1, 36, etc.) and Peter's house (Mk. 1:29). Taylor, op. cit., p. 433. It should be noted also that the tenses of the verbs indicate a "decisive renunciation" and a "permanent following." A better translation would therefore be, "Lo, we left everything and have followed you."

⁴Schweizer, op. cit., p. 15.

Jesus. He told the rich man to give away his possessions (Mk. 10:21). He told would-be followers to "leave the dead to bury their own dead"¹ and to leave their families behind (Mt. 8:22/Lk. 9:60-62). He told them, "If any-one comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple." (Lk. 14:26/Mt. 10:37)² He gave the same challenge in the parables of the Hidden Treasure and the Costly Pearl (Mt. 13:44-46).³ Everything is left behind or given up in response to God's Rule, in obedience to Jesus' call, in the way of discipleship. Jesus not only presented this challenge; he was himself the supreme example. He left his family (Mk. 3:31-35); he knew the rejection of friends and relatives in Nazareth (Mk. 6:1-6 par.); he had no place to lay his head (Mt. 8:20/Lk. 9:58)⁴; he had no money

¹ Ibid., p. 16: These words "underline almost more heavily than any other saying the absoluteness with which discipleship excludes all other ties." The practical implications of the saying may need clarification, but the urgency of the challenge is obvious.

² T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 131: This is "One of the most uncompromising statements of the claims of the Kingdom in the New Testament." Cf. The Teaching of Jesus, p. 309. Matthew uses a correct but less literal--and less striking--translation of the underlying Aramaic: "He who loves father [etc.] more than me is not worthy of me." In the Semitic idiom to hate means to love less. Nevertheless the saying is "uncompromising," because it is based on the demand of Jesus to leave all things behind, including family, in order to follow him.

³ Dodd, op. cit., p. 85: These parables "are not intended to illustrate any general maxim, but to enforce an appeal then and there."

⁴ The Messianic title in this saying can be considered a periphrasis for "I" or an insertion. R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, revised, trans. F. V. Filson and B. Lee-Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), p. 234, considers it an insertion: "Here the mysterious designation, Son of Man, is of course unnecessary and pointless." T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 217, 218, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 70-73, takes the periphrasis position at Mt. 11:19/Lk. 7:34 but rejects it here with the weak arguments that the man already knew Jesus was a wanderer and that the foxes and birds must have specific points of

of his own (Mk. 12:15); and of course he finally left behind his most intimate followers and his beloved people and gave up his own life.

This concept of leaving all, which is characteristic of Jesus' encounter with the disciples, the obverse side of following, leads to our study of certain sayings scattered throughout the Synoptics which profoundly and concisely state the nature of discipleship.¹

If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. (Mk. 8:34, Mt. 10:38, 16:24, Lk. 9:23, 14:27)

For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it. (Mk. 8:35, Mt. 10:39, 16:25, Lk. 9:24, 17:33, Jn. 12:25)

Whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted. (Mt. 23:12, 18:4, Lk. 14:11, 18:14)

Whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all. (Mk. 10:43, 44, 9:35, 10:31, Mt. 19:30, 20:16, 26, 27, 23:11, Lk. 9:48, 13:30, 22:26)

Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it. (Mk. 10:15, Mt. 18:3, Lk. 18:17)

What does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? (Mk. 8:36, Mt. 16:26, Lk. 9:25)

From these sayings and from this background summary of discipleship in the Synoptic Gospels we may conclude that the topic of this study, the

reference. The point of this saying is the challenge to discipleship, and no Christological significance is necessary in its original setting, Jesus' ministry.

¹ It is surprising that these sayings have not previously been collected and analyzed systematically and that their prevalence and importance has not been fully recognized, for they carry the crux of Jesus' message to his disciples and provide, indirectly, invaluable insight into his own mission.

nature and motive of mission, is of central importance. The disciples were called to follow Jesus in his way of obedience to God, and they were called to leave all things behind. The abandonment of everything to follow Jesus, in its radical form of self-denial, suggests that the true nature of mission must be found in its motive, i.e. in the inner and complete orientation of the life of the disciple. The following study, centered mainly around the key passages listed above will indicate that this was in fact the nature of Jesus' way of obedience as he taught it to his followers. That this challenge of Jesus was basically an inner one--though expressed in outgoing life and in concrete action--is found also in the public ministry (above) and in the conflict with the Pharisees (below). This analysis, which agrees in all three phases of the ministry, must lead to important conclusions with regard to the mission of Jesus himself.

1.) The natural starting-point in this exposition of Jesus' challenge in discipleship is the saying, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." (Mk. 8:34/Mt. 16:24/Lk. 9:23, Mt. 10:38/Lk. 14:27).¹ Certain difficulties must be considered first. Mk. 8:34-9:1 is a group of sayings on the common theme

¹The shorter form in Mt. 10:38/Lk. 14:27 is, "He who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me." Schweizer, *op. cit.*, p. 17, suggests that this may be the original form of the saying, that Mark then is the first to interpret taking up the cross as self-denial, and that in this case the saying would not go back to Jesus. On the other hand he suggests also that Jesus may have spoken of self-denial, that the Church may have added the "Christian" idea of the cross, and that Q (the shorter version) kept only the more "devotional" term.

of discipleship or loyalty to Jesus. Although the first four logia (8:34-37) may have been together in Mark's sources, they can be dealt with as individual units in the teaching of Jesus.¹ Since each saying is complete in itself, the question of their original proximity is not especially pertinent. Likewise the location of the group of sayings after the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi and the first prediction of suffering by Jesus, though very apt, is not historically necessary or verifiable. Furthermore, although the addressees are defined in Mk. 8:34 as "the multitude with his disciples" and in Lk. 9:23 as "all," it is probable that these sayings were originally given primarily to the disciples—as in Mt. 10:39, 16:24, Lk. 17:33—and later applied by the church to all who would follow Christ.² At Mk. 8:34 specifically the question arises as to the origin of the phrase ἀπάτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. The natural impulse is to consider at least this part of the saying as vaticinium ex eventu. Over against this suggestion is the fact that this is the sole use of the language of the cross in Mark before the actual event in ch. 15, where it appears 10 times. And in 8:34 it refers not to Jesus but his followers.³ Admittedly there are no contemporary or earlier

¹Taylor, op. cit., p. 380; C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 281.

²W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930), p. 110. In any case the important point here is the nature of obedience in discipleship, which remains the same whether the call is for outsiders to join in or for insiders to consider the nature of their calling.

³R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), p. 36, points out that the theme of Mark's Gospel is "the crucified Messiah," and yet the Lord's Messiahship and coming crucifixion only become apparent to both followers and opponents in the narrative at the final crisis itself. Although the passion predictions may be considered

parallels to the idea of cross-bearing,¹ but it is certainly possible that Jesus could have created this vivid imagery to describe the way of discipleship. The people of Palestine knew exactly what the ugly word "cross" meant through bitter experience,² and the idea of obedience unto death was by no means new. In Luke's account, however, the addition of καθ' ἡμέραν ("daily" or "day after day") reflects spiritualizing by the early church or by Luke himself.³

Now the content of the saying itself may be considered, accepting for the purposes of this analysis the full reading of Mk. 8:34 as dominical. What is the meaning of the challenge which Jesus made to his disciples as it is presented here? It should be noted first of all that the basic challenge

to have post-resurrection expansion of detail, Mark's historicity at 8:34 specifically is evident in that even these contain no word of the cross. Cf. T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 214.

¹ Cf. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Band I (München: Oskar Beck, 1922), p. 587.

² P. Carrington, According to Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1960), p. 184: "Previous popular movements in the Galilean mountains had ended in wholesale crucifixions." Schweizer, op. cit., p. 17: "Crucifixion, it is true, was the most general form of execution." Taylor, op. cit., p. 381: "Death by crucifixion under the Romans was a sufficiently familiar sight in Palestine to be the basis of the saying."

³ W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, p. 110. Schweizer, op. cit., p. 79, is certainly correct, moreover, that the early church understood the meaning of cross-bearing "in a new sense" after the crucifixion. Also, Cranfield, op. cit., p. 282, and Taylor, op. cit., p. 381, note Paul's mystical use of the concept in Gal. 2:20, Rom. 6:1-11. These developments do not necessarily rule out the historicity of Mk. 8:34, for similar phenomena were typical in the early church and understandably so. If they have a legitimate point of reference in the ministry of Jesus, they are all the more meaningful.

or condition of following Jesus is that a man be willing: *εἴ τις θέλει*.

"It is only in the case of the man who consciously wills discipleship that the demands are relevant."¹ The nature of discipleship, or being willing to go after Jesus, is given in the following three imperatives, two aorists and one present. The first is "let him deny himself." The basic meaning of the verb *ἀπαρνέσθαι* in this type of construction is "deny, repudiate, disown," and in this case it means "act in a wholly selfless manner, give up his personality."² The disciple must first of all utterly disown himself in response to God's Rule,³ and the tense indicates that this is a decisive act. This first aspect of the demand of Jesus reflects and summarizes perfectly the picture of discipleship in the Synoptic accounts. That it is not, however, a general maxim but an urgent call in Jesus' ministry is also evident in the total picture and specifically here in the second imperative: "let him take up his cross." Taking this expression on its own merits, without getting involved in Jesus' consciousness of his coming doom or his estimation of a possible

¹Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 381. This saying vindicates the approach of this thesis; the basic question we are concerned with is mission or purpose, i.e. man's will in response to God. Although the use of the verb *θέλω* does not in itself necessarily imply all this, the rest of the saying shows that the deepest involvement of the will is in fact implied here and therefore in Jesus' teaching on discipleship and therefore in Jesus' understanding of the way of obedience. Through this indirect process we find invaluable insight into the mission of Jesus himself.

²Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 107. This is, of course, a theological concept, for its context is the Rule of God.

³Cranfield, *op. cit.*, p. 281: "To deny oneself is to disown, not just one's sins, but one's self, to turn away from the idolatry of self-centeredness." T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 198: "The first essential of discipleship is to say 'No' to self, that is, to every private and personal interest that might interfere with one's complete devotion to the Kingdom."

clash with the forces around him, we must see in it the challenge of commitment unto death. Since there was no precedent for the concept and since crucifixion was the common means of execution and since Mark uses the terminology elsewhere only in that sense (ch. 15), we must accept the concrete meaning. "The disciples must not only forswear selfish interests, but they must be prepared to suffer on crosses, if need be, like condemned slaves at the hands of the Roman soldiery."¹ The third imperative, which in contrast to the other two is in the present, i.e. linear, tense, is the familiar "follow me." Besides the decisive acts of denying the self and taking the cross, or rather incorporating them, the call to discipleship is an enduring relationship to Jesus in the path of obedience.

Mk. 8:34 thus gives a comprehensive picture of the way of obedience to which Jesus called his followers. Severe analysis of the saying tends to mar its unity and distort the simple, striking challenge of Jesus. Nevertheless we can see that the appeal to the will involves the whole person and purpose of the man confronted; it is inner (self) and total (cross); it is the way of Jesus himself (follow me). The mission of Jesus and the disciples can only be understood in terms of the basic orientation of life, i.e. motive. Although this definition of discipleship agrees with the nature of Jesus' challenge throughout, it appears as if Mark has correctly placed it toward the end of the ministry in the march of events toward the final crisis. These words, especially the reference to the cross, were then an imminent possibility as well as an ultimate challenge.

¹ W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, p. 110. He adds, "In the original sense the demand of Jesus is equivalent to a man's putting of the hangman's rope about his neck." Cf. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 131; Taylor, op. cit., p. 381.

2.) Our attention is next drawn to the paradoxical statement which follows the previous saying in both Mark (Mk. 8:35/Mt. 16:25/Lk. 9:24) and "Q" (Mt. 10:39/Lk. 17:33) and is found also in John (Jn. 12:25); it is one of the best attested sayings in the Gospels. "For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it." The topical connection with the previous saying is evident; it can be assumed that the early church or the disciples or even Jesus himself put them together because they speak of the same thing.¹ Here again we have an important key to the meaning of obedience as Jesus taught it to his disciples. The phrase "and the gospel's," which is found in Mark, has been interpolated for explanation or universalization.² The phrase "for my sake," which is lacking only in Lk. 17:33 and Jn. 12:25 and in some MSS of Mk. 8:35, is probably original and is roughly equivalent to "follow me."³ There are other variations in the wording of the saying,⁴ but its message is essentially unchanged.

The meaning of this logion is found in the challenge of total commit-

¹The connective *ὅτι* is found in Mark and parallels.

²Schweizer, *op. cit.*, p. 18, says it "makes the saying universally applicable beyond the time of the earthly Jesus."

³*Ibid.*, p. 18: "Even if the words 'for my sake' did not originally belong to this phrase, there could be no possible doubt that on the lips of Jesus it signifies the man who listens to him and walks in a new way for the sake of his calling."

⁴M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), p. 272, considers *θέλη/ἡκολούθη* and *σώζειν/περιποιήσασθαι/ἡκολούθησεν* as "translation-variants" of a common Aramaic source and the other variations in Mt. 10:39 and Jn. 12:25 as "targumizings" of the saying. It should be noted that John gives the saying a definitely eschatological structure and that this leads to, according to our interpretation, a serious distortion of the challenge of Jesus.

ment; Jesus' followers are called to "lose" their lives in discipleship, i.e. in response to God's Rule. The term $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ can mean "life in its external, physical aspects," "the soul as seat and center of the inner life of man," or "the soul as seat and center of life that transcends the earthly."¹ The second usage must be accepted here.² If this saying is thus read without reference to earth and heaven (earthly life contrasted with heavenly) or the present and the future (temporal life contrasted with eternal life or the life to come), the challenge of Jesus here is exactly the same as in Mk. 8:34. If the $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ is "the soul as seat and center of the inner life of man," then the loss of it in this statement of Jesus about discipleship corresponds exactly with his command to deny the self and follow him. Likewise the alternative, "whoever would save his life," represents the antithesis of discipleship as self-preservation. And this inner challenge does not exclude the sacrifice of physical life in the path of discipleship (which is the first meaning of the term and another element also in Mk. 8:34); rather the former underlies and includes the latter, and the latter gives clarity and urgency to the former. The losing of life in both the physical, external sense and the inner sense is not mere passive acceptance of hardship and death as necessary concomitants of discipleship; it is of the very essence of

¹ Arndt and Gingrich, op. cit., pp. 901, 902.

² F. J. Taylor, "Life," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. A. Richardson (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957), p. 128: "Soul stands for the inmost life, the real ego." $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ here corresponds with "self" in Mk. 8:34, and both should be understood in terms of the Hebrew word נֶפֶשׁ , which means "soul, living being, life, self, person, desire, appetite, emotion, and passion." F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 659-661.

following Jesus. The nature of true obedience¹ is found in motive, i.e. life-losing or self-giving; it involves the whole person (ψυχή). Surely this is the meaning of Jesus' words here.

Alternative interpretations bring in structures of time and space which are not (except in John) explicitly warranted by the passage and which can play havoc with the concept of motivation, wherein lies the true meaning of the saying. The acceptance of sacrifice in a lower realm (earthly or temporal life) for a higher gain (heavenly or eternal life) can be cynically described as "a good deal" because it is basically selfish; this is no real challenge at all, and it is incongruous with our analysis of Jesus' ministry thus far.² Mk. 8:35 does, however, present acutely the problem of rewards and punishments, which arises frequently in the teaching of Jesus. Here we read that the disciple who loses his life will save it and that the one who seeks to preserve his life will lose it. Similarly we find elsewhere the

¹ The words ὅς ἐαν θέλῃ provide a further correspondence with Mk. 8:34 (εἰ τις θέλει) not just verbally but in the nature of the challenge involved in discipleship, with which both sayings are concerned. Here again, although it is explicit only in the negative side of the parallelism, Jesus challenges the will to the depth and extent of the life.

² It is amazing to see how many commentators do not even realize the antinomy which is involved in their interpretations of this saying. V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 382, speaks of "the supreme value of the ψυχή" and the "last risk" that is involved in gaining the "true self." Cranfield, op. cit., pp. 282, 283, speaks of "the incomparable value of one's ψυχή" and of gaining "eternal life." Carrington, op. cit., pp. 184, 185, speaks of "the conflict" in which "the stakes were colossal; nothing short of the eternal destiny of the soul." "We are between time and eternity, balancing present losses with future gains, and present gains with future losses; we take death on our way to glory." W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, p. 111, contrasts "the competing issues—between earthly safety and the future prize of the Kingdom." Cf. B. H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark (London; Hodder & Stoughton, 1937), p. 155; A. E. J. Rawlinson, St. Mark (London; Methuen & Co., 1925), p. 115; Arndt and Gingrich, op. cit., p. 902.

exhortation to lay up treasures in heaven rather than on earth because they are safer there (Mt. 6:19-21/Lk. 12:33, 34) and alternatively to cut off a hand or foot or eye in order to escape hell fire (Mk. 9:43-48). There appears to be a motive of gain in the offer of treasure in heaven (Mk. 10:21) and a motive of fear in the threat of hell (Mt. 10:28/Lk. 12:5). Many other references¹ appear to support this conception, including the present saying as interpreted by John: "He who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life." (Jn. 12:25)

Over against all these, putting them in true perspective, there are other words of Jesus which speak specifically to the problem of motives. Servants of God's Kingdom are not to crave rewards but to say, when all is done, "We are unworthy servants." (Lk. 17:10) Those who work in God's vineyard are not given wages relative to their work but what seems good to Him (Mt. 20:1-15). Although rewards, or rather God's gifts, have an important place in Jesus' teachings, they are promised "precisely to those who obey not for the sake of reward."² (Cf. Mt. 25:31-46) Thus Mk. 8:35 does not state the goal or even the result but the nature of true obedience,

¹Mk. 9:41, 10:23-30, Mt. 5:12/Lk. 6:23, Mt. 5:20, 22, 6:1, 23:33, Lk. 6:35, 10:20, 14:14.

²R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. I, trans. K. Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1952), pp. 14, 15. He loses the point of this insight, however, when he goes on to say, specifically with regard to the saying on losing the life, "The motive of reward is only a primitive expression for the idea that in what a man does his own real being is at stake--that self which he not already is, but is to become. To achieve that self is the legitimate motive of his ethical dealing and of his true obedience, in which he becomes aware of the paradoxical truth that in order to arrive at himself he must surrender to the demand of God--or, in other words, that in such surrender he wins himself."

life-losing, which is itself the way of life, for it is the way of God's Rule. To say that the disciple obeys in order to gain ("save")¹ life of any kind is as incorrect as to say that the disobedient seeks death. The point of this saying, which is a statement about the nature of obedience, is the challenge of Jesus to his followers to obey, i.e. to deny themselves utterly and to lose their lives completely in response to the Kingdom (Rule) of God.² Furthermore, it should be noted that it is the same $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ which the disciple loses that is saved, and it is the very life that others hold onto that they lose; there is no necessity or justification for inserting a dualism of $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$. The life of a man in its totality is oriented one way or the other, inward or outward; he is life-saving or life-losing, selfish or self-giving; he serves himself or God. In this short, profound saying Jesus taught his disciples the nature of true obedience, the motive for mission in the service of God.³

¹ Although Mk. 8:35 says, "he will save it," it cannot mean "to gain" or "achieve" life. The point of the saying is the opposite of this; whoever wants to save it will lose it. In response to the question, "Then who can be saved?" Jesus answered unequivocally, "With men it is impossible." (Mk. 10:26, 27)

² Mk. 8:35 and Jesus' references to rewards must be understood in terms of the radical demand of God's Rule. It was God's Rule to which Jesus called men to respond, and it was an inner and total response of the person which he demanded of them. When Jesus spoke of life, heavenly treasure, or the Kingdom, he was not speaking of something which was received apart from or as a result of response to God's Rule but of God's Rule itself. This, too, must be a present reality. Therefore, we can and must maintain a consistent position with regard to motive; to lose oneself in response to God's Rule is to receive God's Rule. If we must speak of eschatology at this point, we should speak of "existential," not realized or futurist eschatology.

³ In the process of this discussion a consistent position has been maintained with regard to motive in this particular saying and in the face of the difficult passages on rewards. Mk. 8:35 is thus seen to agree perfectly with Mk. 8:34. The motive, which is given in these sayings—at least as interpreted here—as the key to true obedience, has been thus far defined as self-denial and life-losing. It is, stated positively, self-giving. The real meaning of these concepts, as the succeeding discussion will eventually reveal, is love.

3.) Our third consideration of discipleship involves a group of three sayings which contain this same understanding of the way of obedience and which clarify further the position taken with regard to the last saying. These logia, which are attached to various materials, are prolific in the Synoptic Gospels, so they must have been important to the early church as well as to Jesus' teaching. They are all concerned with pride and humility, as their present contexts indicate. The first of these, which has the same paradoxical¹ and antithetical structure as the previous saying, is given in connection with the instruction to the disciples concerning titles (Mt. 23:12), the question on greatness (Mt. 18:4), the parable of the Places at the Banquet (Lk. 14:11), and the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Lk. 18:14). "Whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted." The second saying, which has the same paradoxical form (without being antithetical), is found in the context of the teaching on riches and entrance into the Kingdom (Mk. 10:31/Mt. 19:30), the question on greatness (Mk. 9:35/Lk. 9:48), the story of the ambition of James and John (Mk. 10:43, 44/Mt. 20:26, 27/Lk. 22:26), the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard (Mt. 20:16), the instruction concerning titles (Mt. 23:11), and the teaching about the narrow way (Lk. 13:30). "Whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all." The third saying is found only in one place, the incident of Jesus and the children (Mk. 10:15/Mt. 18:3/Lk. 18:17), but its contexts

¹The term "paradoxical" is applied to these sayings only in the superficial, conventional sense. As the exposition has already made clear, there is nothing enigmatic or contradictory or paradoxical (in the deeper sense) in the teaching which they convey.

and content are related to the other two sayings. "Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it." Although all the context materials are relevant to some degree, it is both impossible and unnecessary to evaluate and examine them all here in arriving at the meaning of Jesus' words in these sayings.

It is feasible to start with the second of the three sayings, which appears most frequently and which is the most readily understood. As the two contexts, Mk. 9:33-37 and Mk. 10:35-45 (and their parallels), suggest, the presence of pride and personal ambition among his closest followers provide the best background and probably the original setting for these words of Jesus. In Mk. 9:33-37, which is a loose Markan construction,¹ Jesus asked his disciples what they were discussing on the way, and they were silent, out of shame, for "they had discussed who was the greatest." Mk. 10:35-45, which is fraught with critical problems,²

¹Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 403, 404, considers it a Markan compilation of "fragments loosely connected at 35 and 36." But "the genuineness of the traditions, and particularly that of the sayings, is not affected by this uncertainty."

²The story of James and John (vs. 35-40) is especially trustworthy because it presents the disciples in a bad light and Jesus' authority as definitely limited. The question of the later martyrdom of James and John is irrelevant here because the same challenge was given to all the disciples elsewhere (e.g. Mk. 8:34, 35). Indeed, Jesus' promise to them to share his cup and baptism can be considered further evidence for the historicity of the story because it belongs with those predictive elements which did not occur as Jesus expected, for he naturally expected his followers to die with him. J. Jeremias (and W. Zimmerli), *The Servant of God*, trans. from *TWNT* by H. Knight, etc. (London: SCM Press, 1957), p. 101. The following paragraph (vs. 41-45) may be a Markan construction, cf. Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 442, 443, but it certainly fits well here (rather than, e.g., after the Last Supper as in Lk. 22:24-27), and again its historicity is supported by the negative presentation of the disciples. V. 45 will be considered under Section B below.

portrays a similar situation. According to vs. 35-40, James and John requested of Jesus high positions "in your glory."¹ His reply, which is in the form of a question, is the challenge of service, i.e. to share his mission and fate.² Jesus did not avoid their request ("to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to grant"), nor did he leave them in the attitude it implied. He sought in his teaching to show them the nature of true obedience and to direct them away from self-seeking (positions of honor) to self-giving (obedience in suffering). His words do not merely correct certain ideas about the present task and the future glory; they imply the same challenge as Mk. 8:34 (self-denial and cross-bearing) and Mk. 8:35 (life-losing).³ This same teaching is also given in Mk. 10:41-45, where the other ten disciples are pictured as guilty of the same pride and ambition as James and John, at whom they were indignant. They were angry "not because James and John wanted the chief places, but because they had jumped the queue!"⁴ Jesus again made use of the situation

¹ Whether the glory and the chief seats refer to the Parousia, the coming Kingdom, or the Messianic Feast, it is clear that James and John wanted position and privilege. The point is that they sought their own glory; their motives were wrong.

² To share one cup is to have the same destiny, whether it be good or bad. Likewise baptism refers here to self-committal, as it meant for Jewish proselytes at the time. T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," p. 219. These concepts of themselves include the giving of one's life. That Jesus' challenge here means just that is suggested by the whole tenor of the latter part of the ministry. Cf. Lk. 12:50, Mk. 14:36.

³ Mk. 10:35-40 has the same elements as Mk. 8:34 and 35: the will (θέλωμεν), the contrast or reverse of wills ("we want you to do for us" and "you will drink... you will be baptised"), the challenge to the life (cup and baptism), and "follow me" ("that I drink...with which I am baptised").

⁴ T. W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospel (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 88.

to teach them, contrasting his way with the way of the world--and, by implication, of themselves at that moment. And his words are not merely statement of fact or description of an ideal; they imply a challenge to a certain kind of obedience.

Whether or not these two narratives give the exact setting for Jesus' saying on being servant and slave of all, they certainly provide its general setting and indicate its meaning.¹ Instead of seeking to be great and to hold positions of prestige and authority the disciples are to be servants. "If anyone would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all." (Mk. 9:35) "Whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all." (Mk. 10:43, 44)

The meaning of Jesus' words is certainly not that greatness is to be sought through humility or that humble service in this life is to be pursued for greatness in the life to come.² This again would be an impossible antinomy; humility which seeks inward satisfaction or future vindication is really

¹Besides these contexts the saying is found in connection with Jesus' teaching to the disciples two more times (at Mk. 10:31/Mt. 19:30, concerning riches, and at Mt. 23:11, concerning titles) and twice to the Pharisees (at Mt. 20:16, after the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, and at Lk. 13:30, in the teaching about the narrow way). It most likely arose out of the former contexts, although the teaching and challenge are the same throughout. Probably the saying, or at least similar teaching, was given more than once.

²The words, "if anyone would be first" or "whoever would be great among you," might suggest that greatness is the goal to be achieved, but the rest of the saying shows that the opposite is the case. This form is typical of Jesus' teaching in many of these sayings, and it gives them their paradoxical appearance. James and John came seeking something of Jesus, and his answer was not a new object to be sought so much as a challenge to the reversal of their wills (from seeking to giving). Likewise, if the disciples would truly become last or servant, they would lose all concern for being first or great--both in this life and in the life to come.

disguised pride.¹ That outlook was exactly what Jesus opposed in James and John.² Jesus rather taught the way of true obedience in terms of self-emptying humility (the antithesis of proud ambition) and self-giving service (the opposite of position and authority).³ He presented the challenge of God's Rule, in which men humble themselves and God is exalted.

We come now to the first saying on humility listed above. "Whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted." It has the same general background as the previous saying, and in two places, Mt. 18:4⁴ and Mt. 23:12, it has the same specific context. In Luke, on the other hand, it is located at the parable of the Places at the Banquet (Lk. 14: 11) and the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Lk. 18:14).⁵ This saying

¹As Jn. 12:25 seems to put Mk. 8:35 in the wrong light with regard to motive, so here Lk. 13:22-30, 22:24-30 give this saying in close proximity with the future state (cf. Mk. 10:23-31/Mt. 19:23-30). To the extent that this promise of future glory is brought in as the goal of service it is a weakening of the challenge and a perversion of Jesus' teaching.

²T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," p. 219: "James and John are prepared to accept hardships now as a prelude to better things to follow—and to follow quickly. They are willing to postpone the glory and humble themselves to the role of the servant in the meantime. They are not ready or willing to find the supreme glory in the role of the servant." To be more exact, they were not willing to do God's will alone for his glory alone.

³Cranfield, *op. cit.*, p. 341, calls this a "transvaluation of values," borrowing the phrase (originally from Nietzsche) from E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 139. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 444, notes the penetration of this concept into primitive Christianity, citing 1 Cor. 9:19, 2 Cor. 4:5, and Gal. 5:13, the last of which speaks of love (ἀγάπη) as the motive.

⁴Mt. 18:1-5 is a curious combination of Mk. 9:33-37, 10:15, and this saying, which is somewhat altered: "Whoever humbles himself like this child, he is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." On the other hand, since Mk. 9:33-37 is only a loose construction, it may be that Matthew has the better version of the narrative.

⁵T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 312, suggests that the attachment of the saying to this parable "only serves to weaken the conclusion in v. 14a." In general, however, the saying is equally applicable as a critique of man's basic egotism, which is epitomized in Jesus' opponents, the Pharisees, and it is certainly relevant at this point.

of Jesus presents the same radical teaching on pride and humility. The paradox, here stated in antithetic parallelism, brings out the depth and totality of the challenge it implies. Once again (as with Mk. 8:35) the point lies in the nature of God's Rule, not in the matter of time.¹ When men humble themselves God is exalted; thus Jesus challenges his followers to humble themselves. Yet it is in God's Rule that men are truly exalted; thus Jesus was presenting a gift as well as a demand. Both the gift and the demand are, however, God's Rule, i.e. they are one; the gift is not the goal or the result of response to the demand. In this saying Jesus revealed the nature of God's Rule and the nature of true response to God's Rule. He challenged men to self-abasement before God.² It should be remembered that this concept, though comprehensive in its significance and application, was doubtless given in and for a concrete situation and was a succinct presentation of the basic challenge of Jesus in that situation.

The third saying on humility explicitly relates this concept to the Kingdom of God. "Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it." (Mk. 10:15, Mt. 18:3, Lk. 18:17) The saying implies a challenge, and the language is emphatic (οὐ μὴ).

¹The position of futurist eschatology, which states that the change will come at the Last Day, and the position of realized eschatology, which finds spiritual realization on earth and after death, are both in danger of obscuring the very real challenge to humble service. If we must speak of eschatology, we should speak of "existential" eschatology, for the point lies in the present encounter of God with man in which man submits to God's Rule.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 279: "Pride and self-assertion in ordinary human society may be bad manners and bad policy. In the Kingdom of God such things are a contradiction of the fundamental principle of God's Rule.... There is only one kind of dignity, the kind that attaches itself to those who seek it not, but are content to serve God and man in love and humility."

Mark and Luke place it in the incident of Jesus and the children, and that incident, especially in Luke, is located in the narrative close to the teaching on humility. Matthew, by placing the saying between the question on greatness and the saying on humbling oneself, interprets it in terms of humility. Whatever its original context, the meaning of the saying is to be found in the challenge of Jesus. Whatever the particular interpretation given to *ὡς παιδίον*,¹ it is clear that Jesus' challenge is given here not in terms of any virtue but as self-emptying, the opposite of virtue. Here the paradoxical element occurs again, for the Kingdom is received, not attained.² This concept of obedience fits perfectly the analysis of humility found in the other two sayings above. The understanding of the true response to God's Rule which is found in all three sayings obviously does not mean passive submission but dynamic mission, i.e. self-giving. God's demand, which Jesus presented to his disciples, was inner and total; it involved a reorientation of life, a change in the basic motivation of the person.³

¹According to Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 423, the most natural meaning of the phrase is "simply and naturally, without making any claims." Cranfield, *op. cit.*, p. 324, rightly shows, however, that the point is not subjective qualities but the lack of any claim or merit. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 14: Man must be "willing simply to be given a gift." Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, p. 134, finds the clue in Jesus' childlike confidence in God (*abba*). W. Manson, *The Gospel of Luke*, p. 203, following the Moffatt translation "submit to" for "receive," finds here that men must surrender completely "to the absolute sway of God in the heart." Cf. Mt. 11:25/Lk. 10:21.

²It should be noted that the Kingdom is received in the present and entrance into it is clearly not something separate and future. This suggests that the same type of interpretation should be given to the sayings on humbling the self, being the servant, and losing the life.

³The emphasis of this study has been upon the absolute or radical demand of Jesus. It has become increasingly clear, however, that God's demand is inseparable from his gift--and his gift inseparable from his demand. It is evident, moreover, that precisely because the challenge to deny the self, lose the life, and humble the self is total, God's Rule is absolutely gracious.

4.) The fourth analysis of obedience concerns the topic of possessions, which occurs widely in the Synoptic Gospels. Here the same basic challenge is found in Jesus' teaching with regard to a particular aspect of life. Once again there are certain brief sayings which state the issues clearly, concisely, and profoundly. "What does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and forfeit his life?" (Mk. 8:36/Mt. 16:26/Lk. 9:25) "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God." (Mk. 10:25/Mt. 19:24/Lk. 18:25) "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." (Mt. 6:21/Lk. 12:34) "You cannot serve God and mammon." (Mt. 6:24/Lk. 16:13) "Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of God." (Lk. 6:20/Mt. 5:3) Also relevant in this connection are the incident of the widow's gift at the treasury (Mk. 12:41-44/Lk. 21:1-4), the case of inheritance and the parable of the Rich Fool (Lk. 12:13-21), and the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19-31).

The first saying, on gaining the world and forfeiting one's life, can be understood in terms of the saying on saving and losing one's life (Mk. 8:35), which immediately precedes it.¹ Once again the basic question is motive, not time. The challenge of Jesus was to submit one's self to God's Rule; personal gain of all kinds is the antithesis of true obedience. The same point is brought out in the teaching on riches in Mk. 10:23-27, and here the reference to entrance into the Kingdom and being saved emphasizes

¹The paradoxical element, gaining and forfeiting (Mk. 8:36), corresponds to saving and losing (Mk. 8:35), and herein lies the real point of the saying. It is concerned with the orientation of life, the self, specifically with regard to material goods. The demand of Jesus implied in this saying, as elsewhere, was specific as well as pervasive, just as his call to respond to God's Rule was objectified in his "follow me."

its importance. Obviously this teaching is more than a superficial condemnation of the ownership of property; it concerns the inner and total life of a man. The hyperbolic metaphor of the camel and the needle's eye pictures vividly, if absurdly, the antithesis between the acquisitive rich man and the obedient disciple. The proof of the teaching was not far distant; the incident of the rich man seeking eternal life, which immediately precedes it in the narrative (Mk. 10:17-22) and is its most likely context, was a case in point.¹ The paradox in Jesus' teaching is present here in his reply to the astonished disciples' question about who can be saved. "With men it is impossible, but not with God; for all things are possible with God."² The basic question with regard to riches is motive, and motive here is clearly theological. It refers to the relationship between God and man, God's Rule and man's response, God's will and man's obedience. Thus Jesus' teaching concerning obedience is basically a challenge to men to empty themselves of all they have or want, to give themselves to God's Rule, to live according to his will. This is the meaning of following Jesus.

This interpretation applies equally well to the other sayings listed above. "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." (Mt. 6:21/Lk. 12:34) The commitment of the heart, motive, is the point at issue, and the challenge of Jesus to respond to God's Kingdom is the context. The comparison between worldly goods and heavenly treasure in Mt. 6:19, 20/

¹See pp. 92, 93 above.

²This saying (Mk. 10:27) corresponds to and confirms the position taken with regard to the results of obedience in Mk. 8:35, 10:43, 44, etc. Not only are these results not the goal of obedience; they are impossible for men to achieve or earn. God gives life, exaltation, the Kingdom to those who seek nothing for themselves.

Lk. 12:33¹ appears to bring in the question of values and the motive of reward, but it is best understood in terms of paradox and antithesis. Men who build up wealth face only loss; those who seek God's Rule cannot know loss.² The challenge of Jesus, as Luke records it, is: "Sell your possessions, and give alms." (Cf. Mk. 10:21) This challenge is specific and concrete, but it is also basic. Thus Jesus said, "You cannot serve God and mammon." (Mt. 6:24/Lk. 16:13) The opposition is between the selfishness of man and the Rule of God. On the other hand, the poor are blessed. "Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of God." (Lk. 6:20/Mt. 5:3)³ The proof of this saying

¹It is difficult to determine which version is more likely to be the original. Luke is specific and concrete, and B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels; A Study of Origins (London: Macmillan & Co., 1924), p. 284, considers it to be the reproduction of Q. J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Macmillan & Co., 1950), p. 175, points out Matthew's rhythm and parallelism, which, he says, Luke breaks.

²The interpretation which hinges on the comparison of values and the surpassing worth of treasure in heaven, e.g. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 114, fails to account for the inner contradiction of replacing one kind of selfishness with another. On the other hand the interpretation given here remains consistent with regard to motive by interpreting the heavenly treasure as the gift of God's Rule, i.e. as God's Rule itself. Therefore the real comparison is between selfishness and commitment to God. Cf. Lk. 12:21: "So is he who lays up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God." Manson himself in Ethics and the Gospel, p. 39, citing C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology, p. 272, quotes a rabbi who equates the direction of the heart toward heaven with the direction of the mind toward God.

³Matthew's version of this beatitude probably represents later spiritualization: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." In so far as this generalization is kept within the context of Jesus' challenge and is not divorced from the concrete and specific, it is a true representation of Jesus' words. W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, p. 65: "The term 'poor' therefore has a religious as well as an economic significance." Cf. Ps. 34:6, 40:17, 69:29-36, 72:2-4, 12-14, Is. 61:1.

is found in the fact that throughout Jesus' ministry it was the outcast and impoverished who responded to his message. The paradox is that those who have nothing are given the Kingdom, while those who have much in life lose this which is the only real treasure.¹ Response to Jesus' call meant to leave all things behind, both outwardly ("sell your possessions, and give alms") and inwardly ("you cannot serve God and mammon"); response to God's Rule, according to Jesus, meant inner and complete obedience to his will.

The incident of the widow's gift at the treasury (Mk. 12:41-44/Lk. 21: 1-4) enforces the radical nature of Jesus' teaching on riches. In that situation, in the matter of giving offerings to God, Jesus pointed out the woman as an example of true obedience. "For they all contributed out of their abundance; but she out of her poverty has put in everything she had, her whole living." Her giving represented her whole living, i.e. herself; it was inner and total. Similarly when an inheritance dispute was brought to Jesus (Lk. 12: 13-21), he went to the crux of the matter, covetousness ($\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$), i.e. selfishness. The parable of the Rich Fool,² which follows, teaches not only

¹This saying (Lk. 6:20/Mt. 5:3) corresponds with the saying on becoming like a child (Mk. 10:15), and this interpretation of Jesus' teaching on riches corresponds with the concept of obedience maintained throughout the previous analyses. In the beatitudes Jesus refers to the disciples' present state (their poverty, hunger, reproach, etc.); he calls them "blessed" (which means in the present); and he says that theirs is the Kingdom. The point is that these men who are poor respond and receive God's Rule, not, as is usually supposed, that their present poverty will be replaced by future riches.

²According to Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, pp. 77, 123, the parable and the introductory dialogue have belonged together "from the first." Unfortunately, here and elsewhere Jeremias makes time the central issue and obscures the basic ethical (in the widest sense) demand. Therefore he finds at v. 15 "that the possession of property is irrelevant to the life of the Age to come" and in the parable "why Jesus regards earthly wealth as wholly negligible." As a matter of fact, however, there is no hint about the Age to come in v. 15, and the matter of wealth is the central point of the parable.

the folly of covetousness, but sets it over against obedience. The antithesis, which is brought out clearly in the concluding statement, lies between selfishness and obedience to God.¹ "So is he who lays up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God."² Therefore the point of Jesus' teaching was not to frighten men with the thought of coming judgment, nor to show the irrelevance or inconsequence of property, but rather to indicate that God alone is to be trusted and served and to challenge men to leave all things in response to His Rule. This is the point also in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19-31). On the surface this parable seems to present a picture of retribution; the selfish rich man enters into torment, and the poor man goes to Abraham's bosom; v. 25 explicitly associates good things done in life with future comfort and bad with anguish. The picture itself was familiar to Jesus' hearers,³ but as in all parables the details do not hold any importance in themselves. On the weight of Jesus' teaching on riches as a whole we may

¹Although the future state is not mentioned in the introductory dialogue, it definitely arises in the parable. It is evident, however, that the central issue, in the parable as well as in the introduction, is covetousness, which is selfishness. The death of the rich fool is intended as a description of the nature of sin, not as an appeal to the motive of fear (to escape judgment) or of reason (to trust in God rather than riches because he is more secure). These motives are only more subtle forms of selfishness. The challenge of Jesus, on the contrary, is to self-giving or commitment to God, which is the opposite of selfishness.

²Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 82, finds that v. 21 "must be an addition; it gives a moralizing meaning to the parable, which blunts the sharp edge of its warning." Rather his interpretation blunts the sharp edge and compromises the clear challenge of Jesus' radical demand. It is here argued that v. 21 rightly interprets the parable, whether it was original or not. It is not a mere moralizing, general maxim, any more than e.g. Mk. 8:36, 10:25, Mt. 6:21/Lk. 12:34, Mt. 6:24/Lk. 16:13, Lk. 6:20/Mt. 5:3.

³Ibid., p. 129.

conclude that here again the central issue is the moral demand of Jesus, and the contrasting figures (Lazarus and heaven, the rich man and Hades) represent the familiar element of paradox and antithesis.¹ To all whom Jesus encountered he held out the challenge of utter obedience to God's Rule, specifically, in these references, with regard to possessions.

Jesus' teaching on riches is both concrete and inner, specific and general. It reflects the same basic challenge as the materials considered previously. It presents the same call to an obedience which demands the reorientation of life. It is given in the same form of paradox and antithesis. The central issue is motive.

5.) One further analysis of obedience remains. Beginning with Mk. 8:34, we have considered several short sayings and other passages in the Synoptics, gradually broadening the scope of inquiry. Although it is impracticable to consider all the relevant material, this final analysis will look at the general, so-called ethical² teaching of Jesus, particularly as it is represented by the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5-7) and the Sermon on the Plain (Lk. 6:20-49). The conception of obedience in terms of motive, which has been found

¹It is noteworthy that just as the rich man did not intend to go to Hades, Lazarus is not presented as making heaven his goal. Hades and heaven were the results of the orientation of their lives, and they were not intended to influence the motives of Jesus' hearers. Again we are confronted with the familiar pattern of paradox and antithesis.

²The term "ethical" is used here merely as a convenient term for a traditional grouping of materials. It is, of course, impossible and illegitimate to make any essential distinction between Jesus' "ethical" teaching and that which is "religious," "theological," or "eschatological." His entire mission and message were concerned with the Rule of God, and the Rule of God was always presented in terms of challenge to response.

consistently at the center of Jesus' teaching, is present in these ethical teachings and is here given its positive content. The positive side of Jesus' challenge to his followers to deny themselves, lose their lives, humble themselves, and give up all their riches has thus far been defined as the call to give themselves in response to God's Rule. Obedience to God's will is here presented as the ethic of love. Study of this ethic reveals that self-giving is the essence of love¹ and that love for God and neighbor is the content of true obedience.² It becomes increasingly clear that love is the motive for true obedience as Jesus taught it to his followers and indirectly, therefore, that love was the motive of Jesus' mission.³

Because Luke's version of the Great Sermon is much the shorter, it serves as a useful narrowing down of the ethical material to be considered here.⁴ Most likely these teachings were given to Jesus' followers, as the opening beatitudes (Lk. 6:20/Mt. 5:3-12) and the concluding section (Lk. 6:47-49/

¹T. W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospel, p. 63: "This total self-giving is the characteristic feature of the ethic of Jesus."

²Bultmann, op. cit., p. 18: "What, positively, is the will of God? The demand for love."

³Consideration of the Great Commandment will be deferred until the study of the Pharisees below.

⁴A. M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 74, says Luke "extracts a single essence from the wide range of the Matthaean sermon." Apart from the critical question of sources, it could be argued that Luke has given in his sermon the essence of Jesus' ethical teaching as a whole. This is, of course, the law of love, which W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1944), p. 79, calls "the central commandment of Jesus." Similarly, according to Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 117, the Golden Rule "can be called the essence of the whole law."

Mt. 7:24-27) suggest. The context of these teachings was the Kingdom of God (Lk. 6:20/Mt. 5:3),¹ which indeed was the context of Jesus' ministry as a whole. And also here, as elsewhere, the call of the Kingdom takes the form of a call to discipleship. Thus Jesus' closing remark, "Everyone who comes to me and hears my words and does them," was not only a call to ethical action but a call to obedience to God's will and a call to "follow me."² The main body of the material, therefore, has to do with the basic challenge of Jesus. When the Kingdom is conceived primarily as God's Rule, the unity of the ethical and eschatological message of Jesus is revealed. The ethic presented in the Sermon and elsewhere is not merely preparation for the Kingdom, an "Interim-Ethic," "but the principle which, on the inner side, constitutes the Kingdom."³ Indeed, it is not a matter of principle or ideals but a present demand for radical obedience, for inner and total

¹Matthew's Sermon has seven other references to the Kingdom: Mt. 5:10, 19 (2), 20, 6:10, 33, 7:21.

²Lk. 6:46/Mt. 7:21 makes it especially clear that Jesus' ethic is neither abstract nor timeless but existential demand in his confrontation with the disciples. Luke's version is brief and poignant: "Why do you call me 'Lord, Lord,' and not do what I tell you?" Matthew's is fuller and less direct: "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven."

³W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom of God (London: James Clarke & Co., 1918), p. 116. The ethic of Jesus demands this judgment because it is concerned with motive. Thus Manson says, p. 114, "When Christ states the motivation of his ethical precepts it is for the most part on grounds disconnected with even this general influence of eschatology [i.e. the end of the world] on his mind." Bultmann, op. cit., p. 20: "Rather, these imperatives are clearly meant radically as absolute demand with a validity independent of the temporal situation. Neither the demands of the Sermon on the Mount nor Jesus' attacks against legalistic morality are motivated by reference to the impending end of the world." This interpretation of the ethic of Jesus confirms the position taken with regard to time in the previous materials.

response of the person to God's Rule.¹

There is only one word which adequately denotes the ethic of Jesus, the verb to love (*ἀγαπᾶν*), and this is the topic of the main section of Luke's Sermon (Lk. 6:27-36/Mt. 5:39-42, 44-48). According to the first half of this section (vs. 27-31), Jesus commanded his followers, "Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you." He told them to turn the other cheek and to give to those who ask or take even more than is necessary. "And as you wish that men would do to you, do so to them." It has been noted that the context for Jesus' words on loving the enemy included, besides the usual personal animosities and sectarian conflicts, "Rabbinic fundamentalism on the one hand, and, on the other, ...the very natural resentment and hatred of the Gentile, engendered by centuries of foreign oppression."² The acceptance of insulting blows with the opposite of retaliation and the giving in excess to him who steals and to him who begs or borrows are nothing short of revolutionary.³ Finally, the Golden Rule puts the other person where the self normally is.⁴ This ethic is

¹Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 14: "That the idea of obedience is taken radically by Jesus follows from the whole context of his ethical utterances."

²T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 51. W. Manson, *The Gospel of Luke*, p. 68: "This in a society which legitimated the extremist hatred of the Roman power and sought to bring in the Kingdom by force of arms is sufficiently remarkable."

³T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 51, suggests that the right cheek (specified only in Matthew) would be struck by the back of the right hand, "a particularly insulting assault," and that the giving of the cloak as well as the coat (in Matthew as a legal case) would result in "nudism." Rather than call these "extreme" cases which present "a certain spirit," however, we should consider them specific representations of the radical demand of Jesus.

⁴It is far more important to place this saying in the context of Jesus' challenge to his disciples than to compare it with the words of Tobit 4:15 or Hillel. The Golden Rule conveys the essence of Jesus' ethical teaching just as

clearly radical; it is inner, involving the self and its basic motivation, and it is total, involving the whole person. It coincides perfectly with Jesus' teachings on obedience elsewhere; it cannot be understood as anything but self-denial and self-giving. Jesus' commandment of love, made radical by reference to one's enemy and epitomized in the Golden Rule, is a demand for the reorientation of life from being self-centered to other-centered--in the theological sense of mission.

The second half of Luke's main section (vs. 32-36) further explains the nature of this love, specifically in terms of motive, and indicates its source. Love which expects return is nothing, "for even sinners love those who love them." The distinctive nature of true love is that it has no external or selfish motive such as reward. Therefore the mention of reward (*μισθός*) in v. 35 must be considered in terms of the paradoxical manner of Jesus; those who give without hope of reward receive the great reward. Yet this reward, sonship, must not be regarded in the usual sense of personal gain, for it is life under the Rule of God. Thus the conclusion of this section is, "Be merciful [Matthew: perfect], even as your Father is merciful."¹ Sonship is not--at least

Mk. 8:34, 35, 36, 10:43, 44, etc. give the essence of obedience. The words, "as you wish that men would do to you," are a radical challenge to deny and give yourself, not a goal, criterion, or principle of action. (Cf. Mk. 10:43: "Whoever would be great among you....") The challenge is to put yourself in the other man's position, i.e. to respond to him so that he, rather than yourself, is the center of your action. Thus the challenge of obedience to God and the challenge of the ethic of love are one.

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 55, argues for Luke's version on the grounds that in the Old Testament "merciful" is rarely applied to man and "perfect" never to God. "As God is the standard of comparison, we expect a recognized Divine attribute to be mentioned." Also, the singularity of the occurrence of *ἀκρίμων* in the New Testament is in favor of its authenticity here.

not here—a matter of position or satisfaction in the Kingdom, whether it be present or future; it is a mission of love for one's neighbor.¹ Just as elsewhere Jesus' call to respond to God's Rule was essentially a call to obedience, here his ethic is a call to service. The content of this obedience and this ethic is essentially and distinctively the same. Furthermore the objective reference of obedience and love is here specified as all men, including pointedly one's enemy.²

Although this teaching is profound and universal in its application, for it challenges the life (self) of the disciple in all his social relationships, it is given here in specific terms. It calls for good deeds to those who hate you, blessing on those who curse you, prayer for those who abuse you. These are concrete demands, and they must "stand the test of being brought into the presence of God in prayer."³ It includes physical harm and property loss. In Lk. 6:37-42/Mt. 7:1-5 this teaching is applied to the matter of judging.⁴ In this passage the saying, "For the measure you give will be the measure you get back," appears to be retributive and to distort the Golden Rule

¹V. 36 thus not only gives the source of ethical action but expresses concisely and profoundly Jesus' theology of mission in his ethic. Man's obedience to God issues in the living out of God's merciful will toward men. Far more than an external imitation of God, it is an entering into God's will with one's life, i.e. self-denial and self-giving.

²It is characteristic that this "universal" law of love should be stated in concrete terms—here as "your enemy" and at Mk. 12:31 par. as "your neighbor."

³T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 50.

⁴W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, p. 71, calls this section "a particular application of the principle of love." In Luke's Sermon it immediately follows the saying on being merciful. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 56, explains the illustrations taken from "the law-court and the market-place" and argues for Luke's priority.

to read, "Do good to others so that they (or God) will do good to you."¹ Rather it should be read in the light of Jesus' paradoxical method and radical demand. The meaning is that in God's Rule self-giving results in-- or is one with--receiving.² In any case the particular challenge here is to "judge not," to "take the log out of your own eyes." In keeping with the motive of love, the legitimate object of concern in all these matters is the other man.

Finally, Luke's Sermon includes one more section, Lk. 6:43-46/
Mt. 7:16-21, which again brings out the distinctive nature of Jesus' ethic. The disciples are called to produce fruit, and fruit is determined by the kind of tree. The context is, of course, the Kingdom, i.e. God's Rule.

¹This interpretation is moralistic and self-centered; it fails to do justice to the ethic of Jesus. Rather, in terms of radical demand, the saying is a challenge to put the other person in your place, to judge not as you would not be judged. By thus obeying God's will the disciple is beyond judgment himself, because he is not acting for himself but for God and his neighbor. It is in forgiving and giving that God's Rule is given and we are freed from ourselves; it is in judging our brother that we assert ourselves and incur the judgment not only of sins but of the basic sin of self-centeredness, which opposes God's Rule. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 56: "He who will not forgive closes his own heart against God's forgiveness. He who despises and hates his fellow-man closes his own heart against God's love." As in the previous verse, Lk. 6:36/Mt. 5:48, the relationship between God and his servants is essentially a unity in mission.

²A similar example of this concept is found in the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer, which connects God's forgiveness of us and our forgiveness of others (Mt. 6:12/Lk. 11:4, cf. Mk. 11:25/Mt. 6:14-15, Mt. 5:7, 23, 24, 18:18, 19, 23-35). The latter is not the ground upon which God gives or even the condition of receiving. It is the essential nature of God's Rule in and through the disciple, the reorientation of life in radical obedience. In this understanding a consistent position is maintained with regard to Jesus' challenge and the motive of self-giving. Furthermore, this interpretation agrees with Mk. 8:35, 10:43, 44, 8:36, as they are analyzed above, and with the actual situation of Jesus' ministry, especially in confrontation with the Pharisees (see below).

Jesus calls for specific, outward action (fruit) based on total (tree), inner (heart) response to God's will. "The good man out of the good treasure of his heart produces good." (Lk. 6:45/Mt. 12:35)¹ This teaching is not merely a proverb or an insight into life; it expresses the ethic of Jesus, which was a radical demand upon his disciples.

On the basis of this brief analysis of the ethical teaching of Jesus as it is represented by the Great Sermon, we may conclude that the same basic challenge which has been found elsewhere lies at the center, and that love here denotes inner and total involvement in God's will.² The meaning of obedience to God's Rule, to which Jesus called his followers, is found once again in the radical demand for self-denial and self-giving. The consistent

¹This saying fits well in this context. Matthew's parallel does not include it, but at Mt. 12:35 it is found in the context of a similar saying on fruit and trees, and its meaning is the same. W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, p. 72: "Only if the heart is loving and merciful and purified by active desire for the highest good of others will it promote the purposes for which Jesus calls his disciples."

²It must be noted here, as in the previous sections of this study of Jesus' teachings to his disciples, that the eschatological question may obscure the issue and nullify the challenge of Jesus. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 37, points this out by using an analogy. "If, in the belief that the whole monetary system of the world is going to be abolished next week, someone advises me to withdraw all my money from the bank and distribute it in charity, he may be giving me the best advice in the circumstances; but to dignify his advice with the name of 'ethic' or even 'interim-ethic' is to make a virtue of necessity with a vengeance." But this criticism applies not only to the position of futurist eschatology but also to the interpretation known as realized eschatology, for here again the main point, the present demand, is undermined or by-passed. Rather, with W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 83, we should speak of the ethic of Jesus as "existential. It demands a man's total life for God." And this applies not only to Jesus' ethic but also to his mission and message as a whole. The answer to the question of time, which we have been avoiding but which has inevitably been arising throughout this study, is neither futurist nor realized but "existential" eschatology. (See further pp. 114, 120 above, 190, 230 below.)

motive is love, which shows through the paradox of giving and receiving. With the definition of the external reference¹ or goal of obedience, the neighbor, we have a complete picture of mission as Jesus conceived it.

In order to complete this study of Jesus' encounter with the disciples, it is necessary to consider the final test, in which it was revealed that the disciples did not take up their crosses and follow Jesus and it became clear that the radical demand of God's Rule was carried out--if at all--only by one man, Jesus himself. What we are concerned with here is more than a "Messianic Secret"; it is the matter of obedience to God's will. The disciples' failure at this point shows up their basic failure throughout. Jesus' consistency in spite of their failure, more particularly in the midst of it, further indicates the nature and motive of his mission.

It has already been pointed out that Jesus sought to bring his disciples to a basic commitment of their lives in response to God's Rule, which included with increasing imminence the possibility of death.² According to the accounts

¹This external context, which has been largely assumed in the previous analyses of discipleship, must be considered to have been present at all times, for Jesus' dealings with the disciples were never fully divorced from his public ministry. The disciples were called not only to follow Jesus in obedience to God; they were called to be "fishers of men." (Mk. 1:17) They were with Jesus and were sent out in the work of his ministry.

²Jeremias, The Servant of God, pp. 100, 101: "The assertion of the Gospels that Jesus reckoned with the possibility of a violent death has the strongest historical probability behind it." Jeremias goes on to list considerable evidence, including the argument that Jesus expected his disciples to die with him (Mk. 10:32-40, Lk. 14:25-33). This could not have been created by tradition contrary to known fact. The disciples themselves "clearly expected indeed suffering and martyrdom both for Jesus and themselves (Mk. 10:39 par., 14:29 par.)."

in the Gospels, opposition to Jesus' ministry was present from the beginning, and the situation in Palestine at that time provided adequate circumstances for the destruction of both Jesus and his followers. Especially after the great "turning point," Caesarea Philippi, Jesus warned his disciples that suffering lay ahead (Mk. 8:31, 9:12, 31, 10:32-34, Lk. 12:50, 17:25). He pressed on to Jerusalem (Mk. 10:32, etc.), and he called his disciples to face this eventuality. They were called to take up their crosses and follow him (Mk. 8:34), to lose their lives (Mk. 8:35). They who had left everything were expected also to lay down their lives if need be. They were given to share Jesus' cup and baptism (Mk. 10:39). At the Passover, when they partook of the Last Supper, the disciples saw clearly how Jesus had resolved to carry out this radical obedience, for he spoke of death (Mk. 14:22-24). It only remained for them to go with him to the cross. On the Mount of Olives Peter, with the others, saw the challenge plainly. "He said vehemently, 'If I must die with you, I will not deny you.' And they all said the same." (Mk. 14:31) The whole meaning of discipleship¹ and the basic challenge of obedience as Jesus had taught it demanded this conclusion.

Yet the striking fact in the crucifixion accounts is that the disciples all failed miserably. First of all Judas betrayed his master—

¹That disciples were to do and be as the master is inherent in the concept of discipleship, and it is expressed clearly in Mt. 10:24, 25a: "A disciple is not above his teacher, nor a servant above his master; it is enough for the disciple to be like his teacher, and the servant like his master." (Cf. Lk. 6:40, Jn. 13:16, 15:20) Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 145, points out that this "does not mean the promotion of the disciples to the rank of their teacher, but refers to the readiness to bear the same abuse which the teacher and master encountered."

after being a disciple for so long, after hearing Jesus' words and seeing his works, after sharing the same table fellowship.¹ When the crowd came with swords and clubs to arrest Jesus, the others of the Twelve, who had just partaken of the Passover meal with him,² "all forsook him and fled." (Mk. 14:50) Peter, who had previously confessed Jesus to be the Messiah, who had just staked his life in loyalty, denied his master before a servant girl. James and John, who with Peter constituted the inner circle of the Twelve, who had professed to accept the same cup and baptism, ran and hid like the rest. The disciples all failed. But Jesus went to the cross.

Why did the disciples fail in this final test? The answer, which is hinted at throughout the Gospels, is that they failed to make the basic response of self-giving in obedience. It was suggested above that Peter's statement, "we have left everything to follow you," (Mk. 10:28) was an exaggeration. It should be added that Peter, speaking for the group, revealed in these words the false, selfish motive of reward,³ which is the opposite of self-denial. Similarly it was pointed out that James and John,

¹Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 153: "This table fellowship is religious, and therein rest its obligations: its violation is a particularly heinous crime (Ps. 41:10), and hence the deep grief felt by Jesus, Mk. 14:20 par."

²Ibid., passim, presents the case for the definition of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. The commitment of the disciples to their master is expressed in the religious character of the ordinary table fellowship with Jesus the Paterfamilias (p. 154), the particular significance of a farewell meal (p. 158), and the soteriological meaning of the Passover (p. 174). Hence, they, too, were guilty of heinous disloyalty at the final test.

³Cranfield, op. cit., p. 333: "Mt. at this point adds τί ἄρα ἐστὶν ἡμῶν; which quite probably expresses the thought behind Peter's question correctly."

while professing to suffer the same fate as Jesus, were looking for self-glorification (Mk. 10:35-40). To that extent their following was not true obedience, according to Jesus' definition. This was Peter's underlying failure when he refused to accept Jesus' prediction of suffering (Mk. 8:32), when he at first refused Jesus' slavish servitude in washing his feet (Jn. 13:8),¹ even when he said he would defend his master to the death. This basic failure of the disciples is found more generally in their lack of understanding throughout Jesus' ministry, for "their hearts were hardened." (Mk. 6:52, 4:13, 40, 41, 7:18, 8:16-21)² They did not realize—in the sense that they would not accept—that Jesus' mission in response to God's Rule meant, if anything, the giving of his life and that their discipleship meant, if anything, the giving of their lives. Therefore, when the final test came, the disciples refused to follow Jesus; when the crisis was upon them, they refused to give themselves to God's Rule; finally and ultimately they were not obedient to God's will.³

¹T. W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospel, p. 62: "Why was Peter unwilling that Jesus should wash his feet? He...wanted Jesus to keep his dignity. This utter self-giving shocked him."

²Jeremias, The Servant of God, p. 77, notes, "the disciples' failure to understand...runs like a motif through the whole of Mark's Gospel," "in Luke the motif is still more distinct," and "finally, the Gospel of John broadens the motif into a constant misunderstanding of the most far-reaching extent." Moreover, the veil of their understanding was in their hearts, as Mark states it, not in Jesus. Cf. Mk. 4:11, 12, pp. 87-90 above and the "Messianic Secret," pp. 94-96 above.

³To say that the disciples failed to recognize who Jesus was or to understand his interpretation of Messiahship is not sufficient. Belief itself, to the Jews, was not a matter of mental cognizance alone. The underlying reason for the failure of the disciples, as well as the people, was their refusal to respond completely to the radical demand of God in the challenge of Jesus. This is the answer to Wrede's "Messianic Secret." It is a secret, as T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," pp. 220, 221, rightly shows, "simply because no secret is ever so well kept as that which no one is willing to discover."

The first conclusion that must be drawn from this final test and from this whole study of Jesus' encounter with the disciples is, on the one hand, that the disciples failed in the basic challenge of obedience, in the basic response to the Rule of God. On the other hand, this same material clearly points up the fact that Jesus' mission was one of radical obedience and that the final events were for him the completion of his self-giving in response to God's Rule.

Other important conclusions arise from this study. It can now be stated with certainty that the question of motive lies at the center of mission, which has here been dealt with primarily in terms of obedience. The nature of true obedience, as it is found in Jesus' teachings, is best defined as self-denial and self-giving. In the terms of this thesis, love is the motive for mission.

3. Jesus and the Pharisees.

The third major element of Jesus' general mission is his encounter with the leaders of the Jews—the Pharisees, scribes, Sadducees, and priests, who are here considered together (under the title, "the Pharisees") because of their common opposition to Jesus. Some of the material that has been considered in the previous section could have fallen under this heading and vice versa. Indeed, it is difficult to draw a clear line between the two groups of material because Jesus presented the same challenge in both, as the following discussion will indicate. Moreover, he spoke from within his Jewish heritage and used the Pharisaic approach to religion as a negative comparison or foil in teaching the way of obedience to his followers and to the Pharisees themselves.¹ Some of his teachings can be considered as either exhortation to followers or exposure of opponents or both.² The facts of the encounter, especially its culmination in Jesus' death, bear out not only the seriousness of the conflict but also the nature of the antithesis between Jesus and his opponents. Therefore this study may be expected to reveal the same understanding of the way of obedience on the part of Jesus, although it is here presented in a different context and from a different perspective. At the heart of the conflict we find the same basic challenge of Jesus.

¹An example of the former is Mt. 6:1-18; the outstanding example of the latter is the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.

²Furthermore, the development of the Synoptic tradition included changes in context and application; this was natural and not altogether unjustifiable, although some of these changes distorted the original meaning and intention. In particular, some sayings and parables intended for the people and the opposition were made to apply to the disciples and thus to the primitive church.

The fact of the encounter between Jesus and the Pharisees¹ need not be questioned, both because the nature of the situation and of Jesus' mission made it inevitable and because the primary materials of Jesus' mission, the Synoptic Gospels, give abundant evidence of it. A large segment of the materials in the Gospels is concentrated on this encounter.² An outstanding example is the group of conflict stories in Mk. 2:1-3:6. In this series several issues are raised: the forgiveness of sins, association with tax collectors and sinners, fasting, plucking grain on the Sabbath, and healing on the Sabbath. The theme of conflict continues throughout Mark's Gospel. In Mk. 3:22-30 the scribes³ sent down from Jerusalem accuse Jesus of healing

¹Although the opposition to Jesus eventually spread much wider than the sect of the Pharisees, these naturally led the attack as the leading exponents of the religious life. A. T. Robertson, The Pharisees and Jesus (London: Duckworth & Co., 1920), pp. 17-27: By the first century A.D. "they had won the sympathy and support of the masses of the people." The "spiritual ancestor of the Pharisees" was Ezra, and their predecessors were the Hasidim. At the time of Jesus they numbered about 6000, centered in Jerusalem, and were scattered all over the country. "Pharisaism after 70 A.D. may be said to be the religion of official Judaism, and it has remained so ever since." The Pharisees were very important in the ministry of Jesus both because they led the opposition against him and because they set the norm of religion.

²T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: University Press, 1943), p. 28, gives the amounts of "polemical" teaching in the Synoptics as follows: Mark—23.5%, Q—10.7%, M—25.3%, L—38.5%. R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), pp. 37, 38: "Another principal theme which occupies a great part...of Mark throughout is the opposition which the Lord encountered and the unworthy causes of it." Robertson, op. cit., p. 1: "The short earthly ministry of our Lord...fairly bristles with the struggle made by the Pharisees to break the power of Christ's popularity with the people."

³Robertson, op. cit., p. 19: "The scribes so often mentioned in connection with the Pharisees in the Gospels were a profession, not a party or sect. They were nearly all Pharisees, though some of them were Sadducees. So the scribes (copyists of the law, then students, teachers, exponents of the law, doctors or lawyers) taught the law from the Pharisaic standpoint, and helped to make Pharisaism popular and powerful." Cf. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1949), p. 97; G. F. Moore, Judaism, vol. I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), p. 66.

by the power of Satan. In Mk. 7:1-23 there is a debate between Jesus and the Pharisees and scribes concerning the tradition of the elders and the matter of purification. At Mk. 8:15 Jesus warns against "the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod." In Mk. 10:2-9 the Pharisees raise the question of divorce. In Mk. 11:15-19 Jesus cleanses the temple, and in vs. 27-33 the chief priests and the scribes and the elders question Jesus about his authority. Mk. 12:13-37 contains a series of debates (with Pharisees, Herodians, Sadducees, and a scribe) on several matters: paying taxes to Caesar, marriage in the resurrection, the greatest commandment, and David and Messiah. Finally, the leaders of the Jews play a major role in the final crisis in Mk. 14, 15. All these materials indicate that the encounter between Jesus and "the Pharisees" was an important part of his ministry.

Two basic characteristics of this encounter or conflict, which arose also in the other aspects of Jesus' ministry and which correspond with the topic of this study, may be noted. The first obvious characteristic is that the disputes between Jesus and the Pharisees concerned the will of God. It has already been stated that the predominant note of Jesus' mission and message was the Kingdom of God, i.e. God's Rule, to which men were called to respond in repentance, faith, and obedience. The religious leaders of the Jews during this period, above all the sect of the Pharisees, were likewise concerned with the understanding and doing of God's will.¹ Indeed, the

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 36: To the Jews (especially the Pharisees) the revelation of the will of God and therefore of God himself was the Law (however much it became embellished in the growth of tradition). "Jesus stands in this tradition, and where he amends the existing Law it is in order to express more adequately what is for him the will of God." The point here is that the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees concerned the will of God; this was the all-important question for both sides.

Pharisees were accepted by the people "as the orthodox interpreters of Judaism."¹ In the Synoptics the disputes between Jesus and his opponents concern this matter of the will of God, as the Markan material listed in the previous paragraph suggests. The scribes and Pharisees, as guardians and performers of God's will to the last syllable of the Law, questioned Jesus on his and his disciples' purity, about their piety, concerning their obedience to the commandments. On the other hand, Jesus questioned the righteousness of the Pharisees, challenging their whole attitude toward God's will, even disputing their place in the Kingdom. He told them, "Truly, I say to you, the tax collectors and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." (Mt. 21:31)² And he told his followers, "For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." (Mt. 5:20) This conflict was obviously very serious, for it ended with the destruction of one party by the other.

The other characteristic of this encounter, which arises out of the former and is equally apparent in the Synoptic materials, is that Jesus' interpretation of God's will and his challenge to the Pharisees were concerned with motive, the inner orientation of the person. Thus when the Pharisees

¹Robertson, op. cit., p. 21. It should be noted that the Pharisees were chiefly concerned with the strict observance of the law, i.e. the practice of God's will. Although the scribes of the Pharisees were learned scholars of the Scriptures and authorities of the interpretation of the law, they were only a small group. Moore, op. cit., p. 67: "The historical importance of the Pharisees" is that "they mediated to the people the knowledge of the Law, impressed upon them by precept its authority, and set the example of punctilious observance of its minutiae."

²According to J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke (London: SCM Press, 1958), p. 101, "the meaning of *προ* in *προάγουσιν* is not temporal but exclusive," which would make the saying even more shocking.

opposed his healing on the Sabbath, Jesus was "grieved at their hardness of heart." (Mk. 3:5)¹ When they were quick and cutting in their accusations against him, Jesus noted that their evil hearts made them say these things (Mt. 12:34, cf. Lk. 6:45). In the matter of purification he pointed out plainly the contrast between the outward appearance and the inward nature, using the imagery of dishes and graves (Mt. 23:25-27/Lk. 11:39, 40, 44).² It would be hard to find a simpler, more commonplace, or more understandable picture than the former; it would be hard to imagine a more vivid and incisive picture than the latter. Jesus thus put his finger on the real issue in the conflict, the real issue in obedience to God: "So you also outwardly appear righteous to men, but within you are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." (Mt. 23:28) He told the Pharisees that their righteousness was "an abomination in the sight of God" and warned them that "God knows your hearts." (Lk. 16:15) He

¹In the Synoptics references to the heart as the locus of true and false responses to God (and to Jesus) are numerous, and hard-heartedness is not only expressive of the Pharisees. The term "heart" refers to the inner source of life and action; it concerns "motive" as it is used in this study. W. F. Arndt and J.W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), p. 404: καρδιά means "the seat of physical, spiritual, and mental life."

²It is argued against Matthew's version of the second metaphor that the tombs were whitened in order to draw attention to them and to warn people lest they become defiled, not to conceal pollution. Cf. I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 2nd series (Cambridge: University Press, 1924), pp. 29-32. This fact does not necessarily destroy the historicity or the meaning of the saying, however. The point of both saying and application in Matthew is the contrast between outward appearance and inward reality—as is the case in the term "hypocrites" in this saying, as in the saying on cleansing the cup and plate, which precedes it, and as in Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees in general. Men see the whitewash but not the decay and uncleanness; so the Pharisees appear as righteous men, but within they are hypocrites and sinners. The fact that the purpose of marking the graves was to prevent defilement is irrelevant, and it is not mentioned; since this is a parabolic saying, it should not be brought in. Luke's version of the saying, on the other hand, fails to convey this striking contrast, for there the tombs are not seen.

taught that purity and defilement concern inner reality, not outward appearance: "There is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him; but the things which come out of a man are what defile him." (Mk. 7:14-23/Mt. 15:10-20) He thus exposed the outward, pretentious obedience of the Pharisees, which displayed itself in meticulous tithing and zealous proselytizing, conspicuous seats in the Synagogues and salutations in the market places, ostentatious prayers and fastings and alms-giving and clothes (Mk. 12:38-40, Mt. 23:5-7, 23, Lk. 11:42, 43, 20:46, 47), and called them hypocrites.¹ He accordingly taught his followers to "beware of practicing your piety before men in order to be seen by them," particularly with regard to alms, prayer, and fasting (Mt. 6:1-18). In this encounter with the Pharisees Jesus pointed to the inner nature of true obedience, showing up the failure of the Pharisees, often as the antithesis of true obedience, and teaching how men should live in God's will.

However severe Jesus' critique of Pharisaic religion was—or, to be more correct, because of its severity—it must be understood in terms of the radical demand of the Rule of God.² For the sake of the Pharisees themselves

¹ὕποκρισις is used by Jesus at Mt. 23:28, Mk. 12:15, Lk. 12:1 and ὑποκριτής at Mt. 6:2, 5, 16, 7:5, 15:7, 22:18, 23:13, 15, 26, 27, 29, 24:51, Mk. 7:6, Lk. 6:42, 12:56, 13:15. According to Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 852, 853, the former means "hypocrisy, pretense, outward show," and the latter means "hypocrite, pretender, dissembler." These terms are directed toward the discrepancy between outward appearance and inner reality.

²This study does not intend to enter the debate over the comparative value of the teaching of Jesus over against the Pharisees, and it is not concerned with the justice or moral rightness of one side against the other in the conflict. This polemic, which is pursued on both sides by both Christians and Jews, is not directed toward the central issue of the Synoptic materials. These materials should be read primarily in terms of the mission and message of Jesus—to the Pharisees and to all men.

as well as for the people whom they deceived and kept from the Kingdom, Jesus had to expose their pretense and false obedience. As in his public ministry and in his teaching to the disciples Jesus presented to the Pharisees his challenge of repentance, faith, and inner and total obedience. To carry out his mission and present his message, Jesus had to be severe to the Pharisees above all. As long as they continued in an obedience which was self-centered, a righteousness which was self-righteous (Lk. 16:15, 18:9), they could not see the Kingdom of God (cf. Jn. 3:3). Therefore, despite appearances to the contrary, Jesus was not implacably opposed to the Jewish leaders, as they were to him. The criticism that Jesus had "only denunciation and bitter words" towards his opponents¹ is simply not true. When he debated with them, when he exposed and censured them, when he pronounced woes upon them,² and when he was judged, condemned, and executed by them, he sought their inner transformation and reconciliation. In this way the radical

¹C. G. Montefiore, Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings (London: Macmillan and Co., 1930), pp. 103, 104; cited by T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 52, 53. Manson replies to this accusation with peripheral arguments concerning the collection of the Gospel materials (at a time of hostility between the Jewish religious leaders and the church), the prophetic indignation of Jesus, his concern for another class of people (publicans and sinners), two occasions of "friendly" action (Mk. 12:28-34, Lk. 13:15-17), and two sayings which show "the real feelings of Jesus in the face of opposition and enmity" (Lk. 13:34, 19:41-44). These arguments may be valid, but the real need is to understand the conflict itself and the purpose of Jesus in that conflict.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 29, lists the woes in Jesus' sayings according to sources: Mark (13:17, 14:21), Q (Lk. 6:24-26, 10:13, 11:39-52, 17:1), M (Mt. 23:15-16). He interprets the (beatitudes and) woes as follows: "It is important to remember that these exclamations are not blessings and curses. A great deal of nonsense is written and spoken about Jesus cursing the Pharisees. A blessing or a curse in the proper sense of the words implies a wish that good or evil may come upon the person blessed or cursed. The beatitude and the woe are highly emotional statements of fact, and not wishes at all; and it would be more accurate to say, 'Alas for you Pharisees...' than 'Woe unto you Pharisees...' as a translation

demand of God's Rule was presented to the Pharisees.¹ In this way it was obeyed in Jesus' ministry. In this way Jesus' exhortation, "love your enemies," was given practical and profound expression in his own life.²

On the basis of these two characteristics (the conflict over God's will and the centrality of the question of motive) and the two preceding studies (Jesus' public ministry and his teaching to the disciples) we may consider certain materials from this encounter which express further Jesus' understanding of obedience. It is sufficiently clear by now that this obedience must be understood in terms of motive. It is also clear that there are two essential points of reference, or rather persons, involved in obedience, God and other people. Just as the "righteousness" of the Pharisees was an affront to God and a hindrance to others, so Jesus' teaching in this material reveals the true orientation of the obedient person

of the words of Jesus in these passages." It would be absurd to state that Jesus' *οὐαί* in Mk. 13:17, e.g., was a curse "for those who are with child and for those who give suck" at the coming tribulation; on the contrary, it was a moving expression of concern. It is possible to see Jesus' *οὐαί* to the Pharisees, also, as concern for them. See also Manson's Ethics and the Gospel (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 51.

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, at several points suggests that Jesus was only condemning the bad Pharisees, not all of them and not their ideal and system. If, however, Jesus was not condemning but calling the Pharisees to humble themselves before God, his message would apply to all of them. If Jesus was not describing the Pharisees but challenging them to true obedience, it is not necessary to defend or condemn Jesus or the Pharisees or to determine the extent to which these hard words were an accurate description of the Pharisees. The important thing is to understand the challenge that Jesus presented.

²It is surprising that a consistent, positive study of Jesus' purpose in the conflict has not previously been worked out, for such a position arises naturally out of the materials when they are interpreted in terms of the radical demand of God's Rule.

toward God and his neighbor. Once again there are certain pithy sayings of Jesus which present his challenge concisely and profoundly. Here, too, lie the parables of God's mercy.¹ Above all we meet here the greatest formulation of the will of God, the Great Commandment. Finally, we must consider the relationship between the radical demand of God and his love in the teaching of Jesus. When these materials are considered in terms of Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees, they shed new light on the conflict and complement our understanding of Jesus' mission and message. When they are added to the ones already considered, we will have a fairly comprehensive picture of Jesus' understanding of God's will. Altogether, they form an excellent definition of the topic, "Love as a Motive for Mission."

1.) A natural starting point for this exposition of Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees is Mk. 2:17 par.: "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." Similar in content is Jesus' teaching that the Father has "hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes." (Mt. 11:25/Lk. 10:21)² The same contrast is expressed in the parable of

¹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 100: "The parables which have as their subject the gospel message in its narrower sense are, apparently without exception, addressed, not to the poor, but to opponents." Jeremias interprets the purpose of these parables as follows: "Their main object is not the presentation of the gospel, but defense and vindication of the gospel; they are controversial weapons against the critics and foes of the gospel." This interpretation clearly presents a problem, for the message and its purpose are made to contradict each other. In the discussion below an alternative approach is given which--we believe--makes more sense of both Jesus' message and his mission to the Pharisees.

²Cf. 1 Cor. 1:26-29.

the Pharisee and the Publican (Lk. 18:9-14). That Jesus' mission showed particular concern for the poor, the outcast, and the sinner was evident in his public ministry,¹ and that his message was for the lost is evident in the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Prodigal Son. But the very fact that these materials are found in the context of Jesus' encounter with the Pharisees suggests that his real purpose was to challenge them to obedience, to show them the true response to God's Rule.

According to Mark's somewhat obscure narrative (Mk. 2:15-17),² Jesus after calling Levi, a tax collector, to follow him, "sat at table in his house with sinners and tax collectors." This behavior--and there must have been many similar incidents--naturally brought condemnation from the scribes and Pharisees, "Why do you do these things?" and the scathing epithet, "a friend of tax collectors and sinners!" (Mt. 11:19/Lk. 7:34)³ To associ-

¹Cf. Mt. 15:24.

²V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959), p. 203, admits that "there can be no doubt that much is obscure" but also points out that this argument is two-edged. It indicates that not much can be known of the actual event, but it also suggests Mark's reserve in the face of incompleteness. In any case the correspondence of this narrative with a particular historical event is not particularly important. It is enough to know that the situation about which it speaks was very real and that these sayings most probably arose out of that situation.

³B. H. Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930), pp. 132-135: "Pharisaism...acted on the principle of avoiding contact with the wicked, and Jesus as the friend of publicans and sinners became notorious." Robertson, op. cit., pp. 76-81, suggests that the Pharisees "probably gave a sinister meaning to 'friend' ($\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma$) as boon-companion and sharer in their vices." At least they implied that he was no better than those around him. The publicans were, of course, despised by the pious as no better than robbers and as ceremonially unclean. Their money was not even accepted for public alms. The sinners were the openly immoral, the Gentiles, heretics, publicans, and even the 'Am-ha-'arets, who did not maintain the ceremonial purity and legal righteousness of the Pharisees. The term was applied to Jesus himself (Jn. 9:24).

ate with such people was bad enough, but to eat with them was "unthinkable"—for religious reasons!¹ On the contrary, Jesus' reply was that this act was in accord with his purpose (mission)—his obedience to God's Rule! "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." This saying and the accompanying proverb about the well and the sick present an important insight into Jesus' mission, behind the apparent difficulty. One interpretation of this section takes Jesus' saying about his mission as irony; he did not come to call those who think themselves righteous.² Another takes the saying as a defense of his right to associate with the disreputable, the negative aspect merely supporting the positive.³ A third takes the final statement as a later, allegorical expansion of the original parabolic saying on the sick and the healthy.⁴ All of these interpretations are inadequate for the setting and for the mission

¹P. Carrington, According to Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1960), p. 64: "All household meals were sacred meals among the Jews," and to the Pharisees, with their emphasis on purity and impurity, the admission of an unclean person to a meal "would destroy its holy character and therefore its standing with God." Branscomb, op. cit., pp. 133, 134: "To eat in the house of such a person would probably entail consumption of food upon which the tithes had not been paid or food improperly killed, prepared, or served. It would also probably involve personal defilement through contact with garments, dishes, or articles of furniture ceremonially unclean." There was the further danger of being drawn to accept their way of life. Cf. Lk. 7:34, 15:2.

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 207.

³C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), pp. 106, 107; Jeremias, op. cit., p. 100.

⁴C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, revised (Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co., 1961), pp. 88-90. To label this saying as a "moral" and an allegorical interpretation is, however, a facile way of ruling it out of serious consideration. If it is read unallegorically, it remains a valid application of the previous saying and an apt word of Jesus for the situation. Even if the saying was not given at exactly the same time, it addresses the same situation and interprets the parabolic saying aright.

of Jesus.

First of all, it must be admitted that Jesus' words are directed toward the Pharisees; the "righteous" ones are the object of the saying, not the tax collectors and sinners and not Jesus himself. (Cf. the parable of the Children in the Market-place,¹ which is directed toward "you," i.e. those who criticize Jesus.) Secondly, we must consider Luke's addition, "to repentance," as an early interpretation of the saying, and it is by no means far-fetched. Luke's version merely relates to the saying the fact that Jesus' message was a call to repentance. Thirdly, a large amount of Jesus' teachings to the Pharisees emphasizes that the Gospel is for the lost. With these factors in mind we may suppose that Jesus' primary concern here and elsewhere in this encounter was not to exclude the Pharisees from his call or pour scorn upon them, not to explain or defend his mission to the outcast.² Rather, the Pharisees themselves were his primary concern, just as they were the object of these teachings.³ The contrast between the healthy and the sick, the righteous

¹Ibid., p. 25, accepts this parable and its interpretation as originally from the situation of Jesus' ministry, disclaiming any allegorical equivalence of terms. There is no reason why the same approach may not be used at Mk. 2:17.

²To exclude or scorn the Pharisees would be incompatible with Jesus' mission under God's Rule and his message of God's love and mercy. Likewise vindication of his mission to the lost is insufficient explanation for the extent and content of the material directed toward the Pharisees. Although Jesus did expose the Pharisees and explain his mission, we must look further for the real explanation of these materials. The answer arises naturally out of the concept of the Rule of God, which is the predominant theme of Jesus' ministry as a whole and which he presented as radical demand.

³The terms "righteous" and "sinner" are obviously directed toward the Pharisees. Robertson, op. cit., p.22: "From the Pharisaic standpoint there were two great classes of society, the righteous and the sinners." Therefore we must determine what Jesus' purpose was with regard to the Pharisees themselves.

and the sinner, must be interpreted in terms of Jesus' call to repentance, faith, and obedience. The self-righteousness of the Pharisees was the opposite of repentance; their self-sufficiency, especially in the religious center of life, was the opposite of faith; and their self-centered obedience was the opposite of true obedience. Jesus showed them this in order to challenge them to the true, inner and total response to God's Rule. He called them, as he called all men, particularly his followers, to give themselves in obedience. This interpretation makes sense of the saying in the context of Jesus' ministry, and it does justice to the nature of his mission. It corroborates our analysis of Jesus' understanding of God's will.¹

The saying on God's revelation to babes and not to the wise (Mt. 11:25/Lk. 10:21) conveys the same teaching and the same challenge. The context is Jesus' mission and message, to which some responded and others, notably the Pharisees, did not, and the content is God's Rule. Although we read that God "has hidden" these things from one group and "revealed" them to the other, the whole tenor of Jesus' ministry was openness, which often met with hard-hearted response, especially in his opponents.² If he could be understood by "babes," why not by the wise? Surely this is another example of Jesus' use of paradox and antithesis to show the response men make and to challenge his hearers to make the true response. Therefore this saying is best understood as a call to the Pharisees to become like babes. This very

¹The saying as interpreted here corresponds exactly with the sayings on discipleship analyzed above. In Mk. 8:35, e.g., Jesus contrasted those who save their lives with those who lose their lives so that his followers would give their lives (themselves) completely in obedience to God. Here he contrasted the righteous with the sinners so that the Pharisees would respond like sinners.

²The same concept is involved in Mk. 4:11, 12 (see pp. 87-90 above).

challenge was in fact given explicitly (Mk. 10:15 par.),¹ although, according to the context, it was given to the followers of Jesus. The nature of Jesus' challenge to both disciples and Pharisees can be defined as self-humbling. It is easy to see how pertinent this challenge was to the Pharisees and scribes,² and it is important to see that this was the real purpose of the saying.³

In the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Lk. 18:9-14) Jesus' message to the Pharisees is more simple and his purpose more obvious; the content is the same. Here the Rule of God is again the point of his teaching, i.e. the reception of God's Rule. The contrast between the prayer of the Pharisee and the prayer of the publican pictures very clearly the true response to God. This true response is a matter of the heart and its motivation; it concerns the basic orientation of the life in relation to God.⁴ Jesus called for self-abasement (like the publican), the opposite of self-

¹See pp. 120, 121 above.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 79: "In Palestine 'the wise' means primarily the learned in the Law."

³Once again alternative interpretations which explain the saying as exclusion of the Pharisees or vindication of the mission to the lowly are entirely inadequate. The danger is not only that Jesus' mission becomes limited in scope, but also that his prayer here becomes the same as the prayer of the Pharisee in the parable (Lk. 18:9-14): "I thank thee, Father, that thou hast hidden these things from them and revealed them to us." Jesus would be combating Pharisaism with an "inverted Pharisaism" of the religious proletariat.

⁴This is clear enough in the story itself, and it is further indicated by reference to Ps. 51, from which the publican's prayer quotes (v. 1a). Cf. v. 10: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and put a new and right spirit within me"; v. 17: "The sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Jeremias, op. cit., p. 114.

justification and self-confidence (as the Pharisee).¹ It should be perfectly clear that this parable was not just a condemnation of the Pharisees but a challenge to them to humble themselves before God.²

According to Lk. 15, the parables of the Lost Sheep,³ the Lost Coin, and the Prodigal Son were addressed to the Pharisees and scribes, and their contents support this conclusion. The subject of these parables is "the gospel message in its narrower sense."⁴ The first two, which were probably twin parables, express vividly God's concern for the lost—in the earnestness of seeking and the joy of finding.⁵ The parable of the Prodigal Son also portrays God's love for the lost; it "might more correctly be called the parable of the Father's Love."⁶ These parables also contain a contrast between the lost and

¹According to the introduction (v. 9), this parable was addressed "to some who trusted in themselves that they were righteous." Jeremias, op. cit., p. 111: These are the Pharisees, who allowed "the self-confidence which rested on their piety to take the place of trust in God." Added at the end of the parable (v. 14b) is the floating saying, "For everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, but he who humbles himself will be exalted." (See above, pp. 119, 120) Although this saying was probably given first in Jesus' teaching to his followers, it applies equally well to the Pharisees and conveys the same challenge as this parable.

²Unfortunately, the real purpose of this parable is not usually recognized—e.g. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 309-312; Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 111-115.

³Mt. 18:12-14 gives the parable of the Lost Sheep in a different setting and with a different emphasis. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 29: "There can be no doubt that Luke has preserved the original situation"; Matthew has adapted the parable to the life of the community, making it "a call to faithful pastorship."

⁴Ibid., p. 100.

⁵This teaching was not abstract, of course, for Jesus' public ministry was one of help for the needy. Furthermore, the interpretation given here shows that his challenge to the Pharisees was thoroughly consistent with this message of God's love.

⁶Jeremias, op. cit., p. 103.

the not-lost. The first parable focuses upon the one lost sheep over against the 99 who are not lost. In the second parable there is one lost coin out of the ten. In the third parable this contrast is especially important; the second half of the story (vs. 25-32) sets the attitude of the elder brother over against that of the returned prodigal. The contrast in all three parables, especially the third, is evidently directed toward the Pharisees; certainly it makes the content especially pertinent to the Pharisees. Since the context of these parables was the opposition of the Pharisees, since the teaching was directed toward them, and since the message concerns God's love, we may conclude that Jesus' purpose here was to reach the Pharisees positively.¹

Once again Jesus' message is best understood as a challenge to repentance, faith, and true obedience, as a call to respond to God's Rule.² Vs. 7 and 10 interpret the first two parables in terms of repentance; God rejoices "over one sinner who repents."³ The not-lost, interpreted at v. 7 as "right-

¹ Jesus' mission and message would be self-contradictory if they excluded the Pharisees. The lost, as such, have no precedence over the not-lost, and there is obviously no virtue in being a sinner. The parable of the Prodigal Son, like the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, points out not that lostness merits love but that love is received by self-emptying. This is precisely what the Pharisees needed to do in order to receive God's love; this is why Jesus challenged them, even with shocking exposure of their pretense and egotism, to humble themselves. Far from despising the Pharisees, he sought to enable them to see and receive God's love, to understand and submit to God's Rule.

² G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960), p. 85, notes that the parable of the Prodigal Son (cf. also the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard) ends with words that, "far from sounding a note of reproach and faultfinding, have a note of questioning and of urgent persuasion. What becomes of the prodigal son, we know; but what will become of the elder brother?"

³ Dodd, op. cit., pp. 89, 90, compares v. 7 with Mk. 2:17b and disparages its "suggestion of allegory." To compare the worth of one repentant sinner over against 99 righteous (or self-righteous) persons is, however, to miss the point of both the parables and their conclusions. When vs. 7 and 10 are read unallegorically, they appropriately apply the parables to their hearers as challenge.

eous persons who need no repentance," are therefore the unrepentant, the self-righteous. This meaning is borne out in the third parable. The prodigal repents, returns humbly to his father, and receives his bountiful love, but the elder brother resents this turn of events because he holds his position by right. Note that the father's love was upon both sons but that it was properly received only by the former. We may conclude that the message of God's love was given in order to be received by its hearers, the Pharisees, that the contrast between right and wrong responses, especially pertinent to the Pharisees, was intended to show them the true response, and that the purpose of these parables was to challenge the Pharisees themselves to respond humbly as the lost.¹ Jesus could only bring his message of God's love to the Pharisees by exposing their self-righteousness, for God's love is received by humble submission to his Rule. In these parables we see once again that Jesus' mission and message must be understood in terms of his challenge to radical obedience, the inner and total response of the person to God.²

Certain conclusions may be drawn from the materials considered thus far. First, Jesus' words to the Pharisees were not merely an exposure of their pretense or an explanation of his mission to the lost; they were primarily a

¹Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 105, recognizes that the second half of the parable of the Prodigal Son was added "because of the actual situation" and that "the emphasis falls on the second half," but he concludes that its meaning is "a vindication of the Good News in reply to its critics." This interpretation fails to do justice to the message of the parable and the purpose of Jesus.

²The purpose of these parables of God's love corresponds with the other sayings considered in this section, and this suggests that Jesus' message to the Pharisees in those other sayings and in general, as here, was, in fact, the message of God's love.

challenge to the Pharisees to respond to God's Rule. Second, this challenge is best defined in terms of Jesus' call to repentance, faith, and obedience; it is Jesus' presentation to the Pharisees of the radical demand of God's Rule; it involves the basic orientation or motive of the life (self). Third, Jesus' mission and message were consistent; he taught the Pharisees the message of God's love and sought to enable them to receive and respond to that love. Finally, the understanding of God's will in these materials corresponds with Jesus' teaching to his disciples and his public ministry; it is a call to self-emptying or self-denial.¹

2.) The next step in this study of Jesus' encounter with the Pharisees concerns the nature of sin. Here we may consider the major "outbursts" of Jesus "against" the Pharisees (Mk. 7:1-23, 12:38-40, Mt. 23:1-36, Lk. 11:37-12:1), in which we find not only his exposure of their sin but also, as in the previous sub-section, his challenge to them to respond to God's Rule. Since the Pharisees emphasized ceremonial purity and since they kept the Law with great care, it was natural that their disputes with Jesus should deal particularly with these matters. Since Jesus was speaking to and challenging these men who were considered—by others and by themselves—to be righteous, it was necessary to deal with the question of sin, viz. their sin. These

¹The structure of Jesus' teaching and the nature of his challenge to the Pharisees correspond perfectly with what he said to his followers. The contrast between the righteous and sinners, wise and babes, proud and humble, not-lost and lost is similar to the contrast between those who save their lives and those who lose them (Mk. 8:35), those who exalt themselves and those who humble themselves (Mk. 10:43, 44), etc. All these sayings teach and call for the true response to the radical demand of God's Rule.

materials present Jesus' teaching on the basic failure of the Pharisees, and they reveal his understanding of God's will. Once again this understanding concerns the inner and total response of the person to God.

Mk. 7:1-8, Lk. 11:37-41, Mt. 23:25, 26 all deal with the matter of purification. Mk. 7:1-8¹ presents a typical debate from the encounter between Jesus and the Pharisees, in which the Pharisees ask Jesus why his disciples eat with unwashed (defiled) hands. Jesus' reply, in which he calls them hypocrites, quotes Is. 29:13, and sets the commandment of God over against the tradition of men, is not strictly an answer to their question, nor is it merely a condemnation of the Pharisees. It is best understood as a challenge to them. The term "hypocrites" suggests the contrast between outward appearance and inner reality; the quotation from Isaiah contrasts lip-service and heart-commitment; and, correspondingly, v. 8 contrasts inner obedience to God's will and the external keeping of the traditions of men.² It is reasonable to suppose that Jesus' purpose was not to vindicate his disciples nor to vilify his opponents so much as to call the Pharisees and scribes to true obedience. The contrast between their outward appearance

¹Taylor, op. cit., pp. 334-338, accepts these verses as a unity and defines it as a pronouncement-story. He points out that the phrase $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau'$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ in v. 2 and vs. 3 and 4 are explanations for Gentile readers inserted by Mark or a later redactor. He also suggests cogently that the difficulty of Jesus' quotation following the LXX is only formal, for the Hebrew also provides a basis for the charge of Jesus.

²V. 8 is frequently interpreted in terms of priorities in the legal system, the authority of the written Torah in relation to the oral law. Cf. Robertson, op. cit., p. 96; Cranfield, op. cit., p. 236. But the Isaiah quotation in vs. 6, 7, whether read in the Hebrew or LXX, makes it plain that the point lies in heart response over against external performance. To Isaiah and to Jesus obedience to "the commandment of God" meant inner commitment of the life to him.

of good and inner failure¹ was presented—even shockingly—to expose and challenge them.

A similar incident is found in Lk. 11:37-41,² and here we find that Jesus explicitly presents a positive challenge to the Pharisees. In answer to the implied question of the Pharisee with whom he was eating, Jesus spoke of the contrast between the external purity of the Pharisees ("now you Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the dish") and their inner failure or sin ("inside you are full of extortion and wickedness").³ He asked pointedly, "Did not he who made the outside make the inside also?" Jesus exposed the Pharisees in order to call them to inner response to God. Thus his concluding challenge is: "But give for alms those things which are

¹ Jesus' teaching on defilement in Mk. 7:14-23, which probably was also given in conjunction with this dispute on purification, though perhaps at another occasion, clearly sets forth the same dualism. Jesus describes the locus of sin in concrete terms; it is what comes out of the heart, not what enters the stomach. Cf. Mt. 12:35/Lk. 6:45.

² T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 94-96, 236, 237, 268-270, suggests that Lk. 11:37-41, 11:53-12:1 is the L framework into which Luke inserted the Q woes against scribes and Pharisees; it is "a complete and self-contained story." Manson prefers Luke's setting to Matthew's parallel (Mt. 23:25, 26): "It is more likely that the woe has been extracted out of the story than that the story has been constructed round the woe." But he prefers Matthew's version of the content of Jesus' saying, for Luke mixes the figure and its interpretation and mis-translates the Aramaic in the final challenge.

³ Matthew's parallel maintains the figure of washing dishes: "inside they are full of extortion and rapacity." The picture in both versions is the absurd contrast between taking care of the outer cleanliness of dishes and neglecting the inner poison. It was an apt reply and an urgent challenge to the Pharisees. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 237: "The scribes and Pharisees are very particular about ritual purity, not only of vessels but also of their own persons. But just as a ritually clean vessel may be full of poison, so a ritually clean person may be full of 'extortion and excess.'"

within; and behold, everything is clean for you."¹

The third reference to the debate on purity, Mt. 23:25, 26, is a parallel version of Lk. 11:39-41. It omits the narrative and presents Jesus' words in the form of a woe ("alas"), but it makes the same contrast between external and internal purity. Here the final challenge of Jesus to the Pharisees, which again is explicit and positive, is: "First cleanse the inside of the cup and of the plate, that the outside may also be clean."

In this debate on purification Jesus contrasted outward and inner purity in order to challenge the Pharisees to make the true inner response of the heart;² revealed the nature of the Pharisees' sin and the nature of this true response. As we have seen extensively in other teachings of Jesus, the inner response to God means self-denial and self-giving, the total orientation of the life toward God and the submission of the will to his will. The Pharisees evidently lacked this inner reality, and therefore their seeking after purity must have been basically selfish. They sought

¹ M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), p. 2, supports Wellhausen, Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, 2nd ed., p. 27, in stating that Luke's δόξε ἐλεημοσύνην rests on a confusion of the Aramaic dakkau (correctly preserved in Matthew's καθάρωον) for zakkau. Although we must therefore prefer Matthew's version of this saying, the theological point is the same: Jesus calls for inner obedience.

² That Jesus presented a positive challenge is explicit in Lk. 11:41 and Mt. 23:26. That his purpose in exposing and challenging the Pharisees was to call them to purity of heart is the logical and necessary conclusion—necessary because of the nature of his mission and because of the content of his message throughout the Synoptic materials. Can we say, alternatively, that Jesus did not want the Pharisees to be clean inwardly as well as outwardly?

RACERASE BOND

SOUTHWORTH CO.

U.S.A.

to appear, or even to be, righteous before God and men.¹ Because they were "righteous" in terms of their religion they were most in need of exposure and radical challenge; they were in need of repentance, faith, and inner obedience. That this was Jesus' understanding and purpose in this conflict is confirmed by reference to others of his hard sayings to the Pharisees.

The most blatant abuses of (some of) the Pharisees which Jesus exposed were their displays of piety and position in order to be seen and praised by men (Mk. 12:38-40, Mt. 23:5-7, 23, Lk. 11:42, 43).² The wearing of broad phylacteries and long fringes, the drawing attention to prayers, alms, and fastings, the seeking of places of honor, the use of salutations and titles were all obvious instances of inner corruption under the guise of outer righteousness, for they were examples of self-seeking in the name of giving to God, self-glorifying rather than glorifying to God.

¹It is easy to see that seeking to appear righteous before men is hypocritical and selfish; it is not so easy to see that seeking to be righteous is also hypocritical and selfish. But the latter is only a more subtle form of the same basic sin of self-seeking. When the message of Jesus is understood in terms of the radical demand of God's Rule (utter self-denial), it becomes evident why Jesus' exposure of the Pharisees was so sweeping; even the best and most sincere Pharisees needed to be challenged.

²In these references it is certain that Jesus was attacking their motivation and that their motive was self-enhancement. Cf. Mk. 12:40: "for a pretense"; Mt. 23:5: "they do all their deeds to be seen by men." In Mt. 6:1-18 Jesus says that those who give alms, pray, and fast before men to be seen by them "have their reward." He exhorts his disciples to practice their piety in secret and promises that God will reward them. The contrast here lies between giving true worship (the self) to God over against enhancing the self before men; it is not a matter of seeking reward—at least not in any selfish sense—from God rather than from men. God's reward is his Rule, and his Rule is received through self-denial.

But Jesus' teaching and challenge to the Pharisees went far deeper and wider. He accused them of failing in justice and love while pursuing a rigorous system of tithing, of swallowing the camel while straining out the gnat (Mt. 23:23, 24/Lk. 11:42); he accused them of rejecting the commandment of God while keeping their traditions (Mk. 7:8, 9). He illustrated their ambivalence by referring to the matter of Corban (Mk. 7:9-13)¹; They made a virtue of oath-keeping even at the expense of the most elementary expression of love and justice, the care of parents; they gave their tradition precedence over the Fifth Commandment. These sayings and this case in point indicate that Jesus' challenge was meant not only for the Pharisees who were insincere and obviously hypocritical,² but also for the most "righteous."³ Jesus was specifically calling the latter to do justice and love and to keep the commandment of God, and this challenge must be understood radically.⁴

¹Note that Jesus' closing words here are: "And many such things you do." This matter is only an illustration of a basic failure of the Pharisees.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 98, with regard to the saying on tithing, suggests that Jesus was addressing only the few Pharisees who went to such length and that his purpose was to expose their sham. The interpretation given here is that he was addressing all the Pharisees, for they all held the ideal of strict obedience in tithing and in all matters, and that his purpose was to expose the desire to be righteous, not merely the desire to appear righteous.

³The conscientious keeping of tithes on minor items (the straining out of the gnat) is evidence of sincerity, not the opposite, and there is no indication that the weightier matters are neglected (the camel swallowed) deliberately. In the matter of Corban it is the strict keeping of traditional law, not deliberate deceit, which contravenes God's will. Nor can it be said that this tithing and oath-keeping are mere sham, for the tithe on such minor items is far from ostentatious and the care of parents is more obvious than the keeping of an oath.

⁴The important question in interpreting these sayings is the purpose of Jesus. It is evident that he was not merely ridiculing or condemning the Pharisees, for he presented a positive challenge ("these you ought to have done"); it is evident that he was not merely opposing their system, for he did not rule out their traditions ("without neglecting the others"). He drew a striking contrast between the essentials of obedience and their non-essential (or even contrary) rules in order to call them to true obedience. Because they were the "righteous" ones, Jesus' challenge must be considered radically—in terms of repentance, faith, and inner obedience.

The importance of Jesus' challenge in these materials is indicated further by his reference to the Rule of God, which was his chief concern throughout. Jesus accused the scribes and Pharisees of not entering the Kingdom of God and of hindering others from entering (Mt. 23:13/Lk. 11:52).¹ Once again his accusations must be seen not merely as negative condemnation but as positive challenge. The basic failure of the Pharisees was, first of all, their refusal to enter the Rule of God. Their sin, as these materials indicate, was their seeking to be (or to appear to be) righteous (depending on whether they were sincere or insincere); they were self-centered--in their religion pre-eminently. The challenge of God's Rule, as Jesus made amply clear to the Pharisees, was to empty themselves and to give themselves.² Specifically with regard to their encounter with Jesus, the Pharisees were satisfied with their own righteousness; they refused to respond to Jesus' call to repentance, faith, and radical obedience. The second aspect of the failure of the scribes and Pharisees, according to this saying, was that they hindered others from entering God's Rule. This accusation is reiterated in Lk. 11:46/Mt. 23:4: "You load men with burdens hard to bear, and you yourselves do not touch the burdens with one of your fingers." Here, too, we see that both the blatantly hypocritical and the sincerely "righteous" prevented others from responding to God. The former put the people beneath themselves and were concerned with them

¹Matthew's version speaks of "the kingdom of heaven" and Luke's of "the key of knowledge," but the point is the same. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 233: "In spite of the difference of wording, the sense in both versions of the woe is the same." The kingdom is the Rule of God, and knowledge is knowledge of God in the Old Testament sense.

²This is implied in these materials, for they show that the righteousness of the Pharisees is antithetical to true obedience; it was brought out vividly in the materials considered in the previous sub-section; and it is essential to the meaning of God's Rule throughout the teaching of Jesus.

only to gain their admiration; the latter set such comprehensive requirements for righteousness that the people were left out by default.¹ Specifically in terms of Jesus' ministry, the Pharisees tried to discredit him before the people and to prevent them from turning to him and receiving God's Rule which he proclaimed. Jesus showed the scribes and Pharisees their basic failure before God and men in order to call them to God's Rule and to his service.

The conclusions reached in these materials² agree in substance with the previous sub-section. Jesus' hardest sayings to the Pharisees were intended to expose their sin and to challenge them to respond to God's Rule, not merely to condemn. He taught that the true response to God is inner, involving the self, and he presented his radical demand to them. Jesus' mission and message are thus seen to be consistent, and his teaching here corresponds with his message to the disciples and to the people.³ In their religious life generally and in their encounter with Jesus specifically the Pharisees—in their virtues as well as their excesses—failed, basically, because they did not give themselves to God and to others. This is the

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 101: "That this mass of legislation formed a burden which few were able to bear cannot be disputed. The result was that in the days of Jesus there was a sharp division between those who were bearing the burden with more or less success and those who failed, between the righteous and sinners." There was nothing malicious or insincere about the scribes who promulgated these laws or the Pharisees who kept them, and Jesus was not merely attacking them or their system. He was calling them to help those in need, just as he himself brought help to the needy. Cf. Mk. 2:17, pp. 141-152 above.

²Although not all of the sayings in Mk. 7:1-23, 12:38-40, Mt. 23:1-36, Lk. 11:37-12:1 have been considered here, Jesus' teaching and purpose have been set forth sufficiently in connection with the sayings treated.

³According to this interpretation it is possible to say that Jesus' οὐακ was really an expression of pity and that his strongest charges were in fact expressions of concern.

nature and essence of sin.

3.) The third analysis of Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees concerns the Commandment—or Commandments—of Love (Mk. 12:28-34/Mt. 22:34-40/Lk. 10:25-28).¹ Here we find further confirmation that Jesus had a positive purpose and a positive challenge for the scribes and Pharisees. Here we find the finest expression of the content of his challenge to the Pharisees—unsurpassed even in his teaching to the disciples. Here we find the essence of true religion as Jesus understood it. The command to love expresses the same radical demand of God's Rule which Jesus presented throughout his ministry. Love for God and neighbor, when it is taken radically, summarizes perfectly the whole conception of obedience to God's will in the teaching of Jesus. It explains and defines Jesus' own mission and motive.

We may follow Mark's narrative and assume that Jesus himself set forth this dual commandment in answer to the question of the scribe.² Whether the

¹The two commandments may be considered as one. They were given together in answer to a question concerning "the first" or "greatest" commandment; in Jesus' teaching as well as in Judaism and in the Old Testament there can be no separation between "religion" and "ethics"; although one commandment is called "first" and the other "second," they are both essential. Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 111, points out that the unity of this "twofold" or "double" commandment is found "not in the similarity of those towards whom this love is directed, but in the nature of this love itself."

²The chief argument in favor of Luke's version is that the tradition would more readily have converted Jesus' approval of a scribe's saying into an utterance of his than vice versa. Cf. B. H. Branscomb, *The Gospel of Mark* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937), p. 220. On the other hand, Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 405, argues that Luke's version may have been "adapted to prepare the way for the parable of the Good Samaritan," that Mark's version, describing a friendly encounter, is less conventional than a controversy-story, and that Mark's context, a series of debates with the opposition, is more suited to conflict. T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 259, 260, takes a third alternative, that these accounts represent two separate incidents: "For the chief connecting link, the conjunction of the great commandments, is precisely the sort of thing

scribe's intention was polemical or not,¹ Jesus' reply was clear and unambiguous; it is certain that his purpose was positive. He answered the scribe's question and challenged him to obedience. In Mark's version the incident ends with these words of Jesus: "You are not far from the kingdom of God."² We must conclude that Jesus sought to bring the scribe to true obedience and thus to membership in the Kingdom.³

Jesus' teaching here sets forth the demand of the Rule of God. The scribe's question provided a perfect opportunity for Jesus to present his challenge, for it raised the issue of obedience to God, specifically in terms of what is most essential.⁴ "Which commandment is the first of all?" The

that could appear over and over again"; the scribe may have replied as he did in Luke because he knew this was the opinion of Jesus and because he wanted to raise the question regarding "neighbor." In any case both accounts agree on the essential point, that these two commandments represent, for Jesus, the essence of obedience.

¹In Matthew and Luke the scribe asks the question "to test him," "to put him to the test." Furthermore, in Luke the scribe asks for a definition of neighbor, "desiring to justify himself." Mark, however, gives no direct evidence of polemic and seems to indicate the opposite. There the scribe's agreement with Jesus and Jesus' final statement suggest that the scribe was genuinely seeking after truth and obedience.

²In Luke's version Jesus concludes: "Do this, and you will live." The meaning and significance are the same.

³If this was, in fact, Jesus' purpose here and also in the sayings considered in sub-sections 1.) and 2.) above, as we have argued, there can be no question about the consistency of his mission and message. He presented the same challenge to the people, the disciples, and the Pharisees, although the nature of the situation called for a different form of presentation in each case. The scribes and Pharisees, in particular, needed to be exposed in their self-righteousness and to be brought to true, self-giving obedience.

⁴Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark, pp. 220-222, notes that this question was "a popular one in scribal circles. By it was meant not which commandment men were most obligated to observe—for the scribal answer was that all the commandments must be obeyed—but, rather, which one was fundamental to, or provided a basic principle for, the rest."

RACERASE BOND

purpose of Jesus throughout his ministry was to proclaim the Rule of God and to call men to true response to God's Rule; on this occasion, in answer to this question, he set forth his challenge in the double command of love.

Jesus answered, "The first is, 'Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.' The second is this, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these."¹

Although this double command is composed entirely of two Old Testament quotations (Deut. 6:4, 5, Lev. 19:18) and although the first of these was recited daily by the Jews as part of the Shema, they gain new urgency in the context of Jesus' ministry. In Jesus' challenge to his hearer(s) here God's Rule and man's response are directly related. Thus when the scribe made a tentative response ("he answered wisely") Jesus stated, as has already been noted, that he was not far from the Kingdom of God.² The implication is that the true response is tantamount to entrance into the Kingdom; God's Rule comes to those who respond in true obedience.³

The nature of true obedience is best defined, according to Jesus' teach-

¹The opening monotheistic formula is omitted in Matthew and Luke, but this difference is not important, since these words—or at least this concept—would have been assumed if they were not stated.

²Cf. Mt. 23:13/Lk. 11:52 (see p. 163 above), where Jesus describes the Pharisees' failure to respond as failure or refusal to enter the Kingdom. In these references the important thing is the present demand of God's Rule; this is not a matter of realized or futurist but "existential" eschatology.

³We see here again (see p. 134 above) the essential unity between Jesus' eschatological message (the proclamation of the Kingdom) and his ethical demand (the demand of God's Rule). R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. I, trans. K. Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1952), p. 21: "Both things...direct man to the fact that he is thereby brought before God, that God stands before him; both direct him into his Now as the hour of decision for God."

ing here, in the Commandment of Love,¹ which is essentially radical. The command to love God calls for the inner and total response of the person. The "heart," "soul," "mind," and "strength" express the inner source of life and action, and they also emphasize the totality of the person—not different faculties or powers.² These two aspects (inwardness and totality), which are underlined by the repeated use of "all,"³ are really one, for they are both concerned with the basic orientation or motivation of the person. The radical nature of the command to love "your neighbor," which is stated more simply but just as profoundly, is expressed in the brief phrase "as yourself." This command, like the Golden Rule, calls for the basic orientation of life and action toward others.⁴ The key word in both of these commands is "love," and

¹It has frequently been pointed out that other Jewish answers to this question were similar to Jesus': Hillel said, "What is hateful to thyself, do not to thy neighbor; this is the whole law, the rest is commentary"; Akiba said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; this is the greatest general principle of the Law"; in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (cf. Issachar 5:2, 7:6, Dan 5:3) love to God and love to man are associated. As we indicated already, however, this study is not concerned to show the uniqueness of Jesus, for Jesus was not trying to be unique. In this teaching, specifically, he summarized the essence of obedience from the Torah.

²Mark has καρδίας, ψυχῆς, διανοίας, ἰσχύος; Matthew omits the last; Luke reverses the last two; the LXX has διανοίας, ψυχῆς, δυνάμεως; and the Hebrew has לֵב, נֶפֶשׁ, מִדְּבַר, כֹּחַ. We have already noted that "heart" and "soul" ("life," "self") express the inner source of life and the totality of the person. Similarly "mind" and "strength" express the wholeness of the person. Taylor, op. cit., p. 486: "The intention is not to distinguish faculties and powers, but to insist on a complete response."

³Arndt and Gingrich, op. cit., p. 567: ὅλος means "whole, entire, complete."

⁴It was suggested (see p. 130 above) that the clause in the Golden Rule, "as you wish that men would do to you," does not indicate the goal or even the criterion or principle of ethical action; it presents the radical challenge to put the other person, rather than your "self," at the center of your life and action. Similarly here, to love your neighbor "as yourself" is not a principle of action based on a recognition of natural self-love; it is a challenge to the reorientation of life from self-centeredness to other-centeredness; it is a call to self-denial and self-giving. Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 113, speaks of "completely reversing our natural will which is directed towards our own self."

it is evident that love here means nothing less than complete self-giving. So conceived, love is the essence of true obedience, the motive for mission.

The command to love God corresponds with the other sayings of Jesus to the Pharisees which have been considered, and it incorporates other teachings on obedience. As we have noted, Jesus contrasted the righteous and sinners to show that the true response to God was self-emptying, and he contrasted outward purity and inner corruption in order to show that the true response to God was inner self-giving. This radical demand is the key to other teachings of Jesus on obedience. Thus with regard to the question of divorce (Mk. 10:2-9), which the Pharisees brought up "in order to test him," Jesus' teaching should not be taken as a more strict interpretation of the law but as an indication of the inner reality of marriage and a challenge to radical obedience.¹ The same can be said of his teachings on murder, adultery, and swearing (Mt. 5:21-30, 33-37), which are also clearly concerned with motive.² With regard to alms-giving, prayer, and fasting (Mt. 6:1-8), as we have already noted, Jesus enjoined secrecy in order to show the inner nature of true piety. In all of these matters the demand is far greater when it is taken radically, for it challenges the person internally and completely. But it is entirely

¹Taylor, op. cit., p. 415: "Jesus does not question the validity of Deut. 24:1 but claims that it was written because of the hardness of men's hearts. He then lifts the issue to a higher plane by relating it to the purpose of God in creating man as indicated in Gen. 1:27 and 2:24." Jesus moved from the legal question to the real purpose of God. He indicated that motive was the central issue (by referring to "your hardness of heart") and challenged the Pharisees to radical obedience ("What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder").

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 155-159: In these teachings Jesus contrasts "the outward act" and "the inward disposition, which may or may not produce the act." He goes beyond the legal question to the person, presenting the challenge of radical obedience.

different from the legalism of the scribes and Pharisees; it is certainly not an extended, more rigid legalism. God's will is summed up in the law of love. The basis of all true obedience is self-giving.

The best commentary on the command to "love your neighbor as yourself" is found in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:29-37), which was uttered in the midst of a similar, if not the same, discussion. In response to a lawyer's question, "And who is my neighbor?" Jesus portrayed vividly the meaning of true neighborliness, i.e. love for one's neighbor.¹ He switched from the legal question, the definition of neighbor, to the real issue, motive. He contrasted different responses to the man in need in order to show the true response; his purpose was clearly to challenge his interrogator to make this true response. Thus, when he had finished the parable, he asked which of the three "proved neighbor" and said, "Go and do likewise." The nature of the teaching and the challenge is radical; loving your neighbor as yourself means giving to him according to his need, making him the center of your action (the opposite of self-centeredness).²

¹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 142, draws attention to the inconsistency between the scribe's question in v. 29 ("about the object of love") and Jesus' question in v. 36 ("about the subject of love"). But this is precisely the point here and throughout Jesus' conflict with the Pharisees. They kept the law strictly, rigidly, conscientiously; Jesus called them to radical obedience. They wanted to know what was right and to be righteous; Jesus challenged them to give themselves in love (cf. Mt. 23:23, 24/Lk. 11:42, Mk. 7:8, 9 above p. 162). T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 261, 262: "Failure in the observance of the great commandment comes not from lack of precise information about the application of it, but from lack of love. The point of the parable is that if a man has love in his heart, it will tell him who his neighbor is; and this is the only possible answer to the lawyer's question." "The conclusion implicit in the whole parable: it is wrong to construe Lev. 19:18 in terms of 'neighbor'; you must construe it in terms of 'love.' For it is love that is fundamental, not neighborhood."

²E. Stauffer (and G. Quell), Love, trans. from TWNT by J. R. Coates (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), p. 47: "Jesus destroyed the old centripetal grading system in which the center was 'I,' but retained the idea of the neighbor as organizing principle and founded a new system, in which the center was 'Thou.'" We may question whether Jesus "founded a new system," but certainly he did call for the basic reorientation of the person in love.

It should be noted that the teaching and challenge of this parable are directed especially toward the Pharisees. According to the introduction, the scribe raised the question because he wanted "to justify himself." In the parable itself the illustration of true love for one's neighbor becomes vital because it crosses the traditional line of hate and mutual exclusion between Jews and Samaritans. But since it is from a Samaritan that love goes out to a Jew—rather than vice versa—and since this response is contrasted with the failure of a priest and a Levite, two representatives of Judaism, "ministers of God,"¹ we must conclude that Jesus was deliberately bringing his challenge to bear upon the scribes and Pharisees, in particular this lawyer who asked the question.² He was calling them to give themselves in love, even as the Samaritan in the story. To ask a learned Jewish scribe or a righteous Pharisee to learn from a Samaritan, even though this was only

¹It is usually pointed out that the priest and Levite would have avoided contact with the apparently dead man "on Levitical grounds," the priest because of the prohibition in Lev. 21:1 and the Levite "possibly because he was on his way to perform his Temple service." Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 141. If this is so, it is another illustration of the religion or obedience of men opposing the purpose and love of God (cf. Mk. 7:9-13 above p. 162). The parable makes no explicit reference to this point, however.

²The choice of characters in the parable was certainly deliberate, but its purpose has sometimes been misinterpreted. Thus J. Moffatt, Love in the New Testament (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929), p. 121, says that the parable "extends 'neighbor' to cover an outsider." Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 142; Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 111. This inference is, at most, only a by-product, for Jesus' real purpose was to show true love of neighbor, not to define neighbor. If he had merely wanted to extend the concept of "neighbor" to include outsiders, we would expect him to describe a Jew loving a Samaritan, for then the issue would not be confused. No, once again we have a sharp contrast, like that between the righteous and the sinner (Mk. 2:17) and the Pharisee and the publican (Lk. 18:9-14), which is intended to expose—even shock—Jesus' "righteous" hearers and to challenge them, particularly, with his radical demand.

a parable, was shocking—but no more so than other sayings of Jesus which we have considered already. Here again we see that the form of Jesus' teaching is especially suited to his hearers and that it drives home the radical nature of his demand.

We may conclude this discussion by suggesting that the Commandment of Love summarizes and epitomizes Jesus' ministry as a whole. In answer to the question, "Which commandment is the first of all?" Jesus presented his radical demand; he called for complete self-giving in love for God and neighbor. Under the Commandment of Love we may subsume all that has been analyzed of Jesus' mission and message (general): his call to the people to "repent," "believe," and "follow me"; his teaching to the disciples to deny and give themselves in obedience; his exposure of and challenge to the Pharisees. With this two-fold orientation of the person in obedience we arrive at a comprehensive theology of mission. Finally, in this teaching we find not only Jesus' challenge to others but also, indirectly but undeniably, his own mission and motive.

4.) The fourth and final analysis of Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees concerns a theological problem, the relationship between God's gift and his demand. It has been noted that Jesus' sayings to the Pharisees included the parables of mercy with their message of God's love, and it has been suggested that these should be understood as challenge to the Pharisees. Jesus' hardest sayings to the Pharisees have here been interpreted in terms of a positive purpose and a positive challenge toward them. In the Commandment of Love and elsewhere it is certain that Jesus did challenge the Phari-

sees and scribes with the radical demand of God's Rule and sought to bring them into the Kingdom. We shall consider here certain materials which will define further what has been implied throughout, the unity of God's gift and his demand, of man's response to God's Rule and his receipt of God's love, of God's Rule and man's response.

First there is the incident of the woman with the ointment and the parable of the Two Debtors (Lk. 7:36-50).¹ It has been suggested that this incident followed upon and was occasioned by a sermon by Jesus in the Synagogue²; in any case its general context was Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom and his challenge to men to respond. The woman who was a sinner made an unusual, demonstrative response to Jesus, and Simon the Pharisee took exception to this--that Jesus should allow such a thing to happen. In this situation Jesus explained to the Pharisee the woman's behavior with the help of a parable; more than that he used this opportunity to teach him concerning the nature of true response to God's Rule and to bring home his challenge to the Pharisee himself.³ With regard to the parable of the Two Debtors the Pharisee admitted that the man who had been forgiven a

¹Cf. Mk. 14:3-9/Mt. 26:6-13, Jn. 12:1-8. The question of the relationship between these accounts is too complex to be considered here.

²Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 101: "Since it was a meritorious act to invite traveling teachers, especially if they had preached in the synagogue, to a sabbath meal, we may at all events infer that before the episode which the story relates took place, Jesus had preached a sermon which had impressed them all, the host, the guests, and an uninvited guest, the woman."

³*Ibid.*, p. 102, states that Jesus was merely explaining why he had allowed this woman to touch him. But this interpretation is inadequate, for Jesus' teaching was obviously directed toward the Pharisee. Since Jesus' message was always concerned with God's Rule and since it is here concerned with God's love, his purpose must have been to reach, not to exclude, the Pharisee.

great debt would be more grateful ("will love him more") than the man released from a small debt. In the subsequent explanation he was told that the sins of this woman, "which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much."¹ Jesus thus revealed that the true response to God's Rule is genuine and complete gratitude or love.² He contrasted this woman's response with the Pharisee's failure in common household courtesy not in order to embarrass or condemn him, not merely to explain her behavior, but to call him to respond humbly, as this sinful woman, to God's Rule.³

The point which is of particular interest here is the question of the relationship between God's gift and his demand. Was this woman forgiven

¹The temptation is to concentrate on the size of the debts. But surely Jesus did not intend to tell the Pharisees that they had less debt or less sin before God; on the contrary he spent himself trying to show them that they were misguided because of their "virtue," that their "righteousness" was of the essence of sin. Furthermore, in the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, which has the same message, the amounts concerned (wages) are equal. The point must lie in the response.

²The parable and the explanation do not teach that God loves the sinner more because (s)he is a sinner and the Pharisee less because he is a Pharisee, for this would be self-contradictory. Nor do they teach, as Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 102, states, that "Only the poor can fathom the full meaning of God's goodness"—for the same reason. Since the point is not concerned with the direction of God's love or the relative amounts of debt, it must be concerned with the nature of true response. Jesus was not telling the Pharisee that this woman knows more of God's love than he because she is a sinner but that she, a "sinner," responds and receives forgiveness while he, a "righteous" man, does not respond and does not receive. Cf. especially the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican and the parable of the Prodigal Son.

³The method and form of Jesus' teaching here correspond with what we have seen frequently in his sayings and parables to the Pharisees. He contrasts different responses to God's Rule in order to reveal the right response. He directs the contrast particularly toward the Pharisees, often shockingly, in order to bring home the radical nature of his challenge. Thus he asks Simon the Pharisee to see in this sinful woman's scandalous behavior the true response to God's Rule and asks him to follow her example.

because she loved much, or did she love much because she was forgiven?¹ The parable would seem to require the latter interpretation, for there forgiveness obviously preceded gratitude. But it is quite possible that neither alternative is fully correct and that the point lies elsewhere. With regard to the sinful woman, the point does not concern the sequence or causal connection between receiving forgiveness and showing love; rather they are one experience. She responded to Jesus (i.e. to his message), and he recognized that she was forgiven. He told her, "Your sins are forgiven." With regard to the Pharisee, we have already suggested that Jesus' purpose was to challenge him. The point once again is not that he was already forgiven and therefore should show his gratitude; rather he should respond humbly as this woman and receive forgiveness. What is involved here is an existential encounter between God and man.² God's love comes as demand, and a man receives God's love by submission to his Rule.

The parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard (Mt. 20:1-16) also presents Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees and deals with the problem at hand. The setting of this parable was the scribes' and Pharisees' criticism of Jesus' ministry to "publicans and sinners."³ The message of the parable speaks to

¹W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930), pp. 84, 85, states the two traditional positions. According to one interpretation the woman's action "is primarily one of confession," on which ground forgiveness is bestowed. In the other interpretation, which Manson prefers, her act is "one of unbounded gratitude for a forgiveness already bestowed, of which her love is the result and proof."

²Response to God's Rule is not the condition of receiving forgiveness, for in the parable of the Two Debtors forgiveness precedes gratitude. But neither is the response merely the result or proof of forgiveness, for Jesus was here calling the Pharisee to respond and to receive. We must conclude that the meaning of Jesus' teaching is found in the radical, existential demand of God's Rule.

³Dodd, op. cit., p. 92; Jeremias, op. cit., p. 27.

this situation and answers this criticism. The employer generously gives as much to those who have worked only one hour as to those who have worked all day. This is a parable of mercy, for it portrays God's goodness toward the undeserving. But the point really lies not in the giving out of equal wages but in the response this action receives.¹ The important thing is to decide what Jesus' purpose was at this point. Was he merely rebuking the Pharisees or vindicating his ministry to the lost?² Or did he have a more positive purpose; was he in fact calling the Pharisees themselves to repentance, faith, and obedience? This last alternative, which usually is not even considered, is the most likely, since it makes far more sense out of Jesus' mission in general and here specifically.³ Thus the contrast between the last workers, who gladly receive their denarius, and the first ones, who grumble on receiving theirs, was meant to show the Pharisees their ingratitude and to call them to respond like the others. The radical nature of God's Rule is seen not only in the fact that it is given without reference to merit but also in that it is rightly received without reference to merit. It is once again brought home to the Pharisees in shocking form, for they, the "righteous" ones,

¹If Jesus had wanted merely to portray God's mercy, he would have stopped with vs. 1-8. The latter half of the parable, which draws attention to the reaction to or receiving of God's mercy, clearly becomes the dominant interest.

²Jeremias, op. cit., p. 27, points out that this is a "double-edged" parable, that the emphasis is therefore on the second half, and that "Jesus was minded to show [the Pharisees] how unjustified, hateful, loveless and unmerciful was their criticism." He then concludes--quite erroneously we believe--that Jesus' purpose was to vindicate the gospel against the critics. Cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 92.

³The basic argument for this interpretation has been given several times already. It may be stated simply in the form of a question: Would--or could--Jesus have spoken to the Pharisees repeatedly of God's love and mercy without offering it to them?

are told to follow the example of these unworthy sinners.

It is evident that the theological problem, the relationship between God's gift and his demand, lies at the center of this parable also. It is particularly clear here that the question cannot be posed in terms of sequence and causal connection, for here the work is done first and then the wages are paid. No, Jesus' purpose was to present the gift and the demand of God's Rule as one existential reality. The poor and the sinners responded and received; the Pharisees asserted themselves, their rights, their righteousness. Jesus called the latter, specifically, to respond and receive humbly as those whom they criticized.¹

Other parables from Jesus' encounter with the Pharisees contain the same challenge and maintain the same unity of God's love and his demand. The parable of the Prodigal Son (Lk. 15:11-32), which we have already considered,² contrasts the repentant return of the lost son with the resentful attitude of the older son in order to challenge the scribes and Pharisees, who were like the latter, to respond like the former. Here the giving and receiving of God's love are essentially one, for, although the father loves both sons, only the one who

¹ Note that here and throughout this encounter it is the Pharisees' virtue, not just their pretense, which makes humble response so difficult. Having worked all day, for twelve hours, through the heat of the sun, they have every right to expect more than those who worked only one hour. But Jesus taught that the demand of God's Rule is essentially radical; it is not a matter of rights but of self-denial and self-giving. This was his challenge to the Pharisees--and to the disciples and to the people. Because it was radical, it was so hard on the Pharisees and yet so open to all the people, even publicans and sinners. Because it was inner and total, it was intended to free the Pharisees as well as the sinners from themselves and to reconcile them to God. Therefore we must conclude that God's gift and his demand are one, for they are both no more and no less than God's Rule.

² See pp. 154-156 above.

responds really receives it. The parable of the Great Supper (Mt. 22:1-10/Lk. 14:16-24) contrasts the respectable guests, who decline the invitation, and the unnotables, who come and partake of the banquet, in order that the Pharisees, who were like the former, might respond like the latter.¹ Here it is self-evident that God's demand and his gift are one, that to respond to his demand is to receive his gift. The parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mk. 12:1-11 par.) speaks of the tenants' refusal to give the Lord his due and of his giving the vineyard to others, but Jesus' purpose was not to condemn or exclude but to challenge the Pharisees.² Here God's Rule and man's response are again united; those who refuse to respond exclude themselves. These parables, like the two previous ones, are concerned above all with the existential encounter between God and man in which God calls men to respond to his Rule.

The simple and profound solution to the theological problem which we have considered here is that God's gift and his demand are one. Jesus not only offered a positive challenge to the Pharisees; he also offered in that challenge God's love and mercy. This is the meaning of these materials and also of Jesus'

¹Dodd, op. cit., p. 91, points out that the invitation ("Come, for all is ready") corresponds to Jesus' call to repentance ("Repent, for the Kingdom of God has come") but fails to see that this challenge was deliberately and peculiarly directed toward the Pharisees. Similarly, Jeremias, op. cit., p. 36, states that the parable was "applied by Jesus to his critics and opponents in order to vindicate the good news against them."

²Dodd, op. cit., p. 94, suggests that the parable originally closed, "as a parable should," with a question such as v. 9: "What will the owner of the vineyard do?" or "What did these men deserve?" We must conclude, against both Dodd and Jeremias, that Jesus showed the Pharisees that they were excluding themselves from God's Rule in order to call them to respond aright—not to pronounce judgment on them or to vindicate his mission to the lost.

challenge to the Pharisees throughout the Synoptic materials, even where there is no hint of God's love.¹ When Jesus spoke of his mission to sinners and the lost, when he pronounced harsh woes, when he taught the Great Commandment, and when he told the parables of mercy, he sought to reach the Pharisees, specifically, with God's love and His demand.² He challenged them to give themselves to and to receive God's Rule. Therefore we can say unequivocally that Jesus' mission was one of love—even in the midst of his conflict with the Pharisees.

This conclusion (that God's gift and his demand are one) applies not only to Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees but also to the other aspects of his ministry. To the people Jesus proclaimed Good News, but this was a call to repentance.³ To the disciples he taught the way of obedience, but this was also the way of entrance into the Kingdom.⁴ So also Jesus exposed and challenged the Pharisees in order that they might not refuse to respond and

¹Cf. the parable of the Two Sons (Mt. 21:28-31) and the sayings on the salt losing its savor (Mk. 9:50, Mt. 5:13, Lk. 14:34, 35), the mote and the beam (Mt. 7:3-5/Lk. 6:41, 42), the blind leading the blind (Mt. 15:14/Lk. 6:39). Probably all of these were originally addressed to the Pharisees, and they all gain new significance when they are read in terms of the positive challenge of Jesus, the radical demand of God's Rule.

²Cf. especially Mt. 23:13/Lk. 11:62 (see p. 163 above), where Jesus spoke of the Pharisees' refusal to respond as failure to enter the Kingdom, and Mk. 12:34 (see above p. 166), where Jesus told the scribe who responded tentatively that he was not far from the Kingdom.

³In the study of Jesus' public ministry we noted that not only his preaching but also his teaching, healing, and calling disciples contained at the center this element of challenge or demand.

⁴In the study of Jesus' encounter with the disciples we concentrated on Jesus' concept of obedience, but we also emphasized that true obedience was response to God's Rule, i.e. the way of entrance into the Kingdom. E.g. Mk. 10:15 (see p. 120 above) states explicitly that to fail to respond is to fail to enter the Kingdom.

receive God's Rule. Throughout his ministry Jesus sought to bring men to an existential, personal encounter with God the King, that giving themselves to him they might receive his Rule.¹

We come now to the end of the conflict, which was the logical conclusion of Jesus' encounter with the Pharisees, in which the antithesis between them was completed and they both fulfilled their chosen courses of action. The "righteous" Pharisees carried out their opposition to the ultimate extent, the destruction of their enemy. Jesus lived out his message and carried out his mission of self-giving with the ultimate sacrifice of his life, specifically for those who destroyed him.² The end of the conflict was only the culmination of the basic factors which were present from the beginning.

It was noted at the outset of this study that a large segment of the Synoptic materials is concerned with this conflict; these materials convey not only the prevalence of the opposition to Jesus but also its seriousness. Jesus was accused of breaking the Sabbath,³ and the penalty for this was death by

¹ Once again because we are speaking of God's Rule we must refer to the question of time, and because we are dealing with the important matter of motive we must come out against the positions of both futurist and realized eschatology. Surely what Jesus was concerned with was present submission to God's Rule. Because God's Rule is both gift and demand, it is, as we have noted throughout all three aspects of his ministry, an existential reality.

² According to the interpretation given in this study Jesus pursued the Pharisees in order to reach them with the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. Therefore we must conclude that he died not only at their hand but also for them. The word from the cross, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Lk. 23:34), if historical, only confirms what has become evident throughout, that Jesus was seeking to win his opponents to God and that he was giving himself for them.

³ Mk. 2:23-28 par., 3:1-6 par., Lk. 13:10-17, 14:1-6, Jn. 5:1-18, 9:12. Note that in every case the issue for Jesus was doing good on the Sabbath and for the Pharisees it was simply a legal question.

stoning (Ex. 31:14, 15, 35:2). He was accused of forgiving sins,¹ which is blasphemy,² and this, too, was punishable by death (Lev. 24:16). Finally, at his trial before the Sanhedrin Jesus was accused of threatening to destroy the Temple and of posing as Messiah, and he was condemned to death.³ Besides these excerpts from the ministry, the narrative and structure of the Gospels, particularly Mark, portray the impending doom from the beginning. At the conclusion of the first group of conflict stories we read, "The Pharisees went out, and immediately held counsel with the Herodians against him, how to destroy him." (Mk. 3:6) At Mk. 6:14-29 the execution of John the Baptist is described—with obvious portent for John's greatest "convert."⁴ The introduction to one of the debates indicates that the purpose of Jesus' opponents was "to entrap him in his talk." (Mk. 12:13) We read that after Jesus cleansed the Temple the chief priest and the scribes "sought a way to destroy him" (Mk. 11:18) and that as the fateful Passover drew near they "were seeking how to arrest him by stealth,

¹Mk. 2:1-13 par. The difficulties in this passage are manifold. Vs. 5b-10a may well have been inserted, but they are not necessarily non-dominical. The passive voice in the clause "Your sins are forgiven" suggests that it is God who forgives, for the passive was frequently used in place of the divine name. V. 10a reads like an explanation added by later tradition. It is probable that Jesus did not actually claim to forgive sins but that the scribes were eager to bring this charge against him.

²To forgive sins was regarded as blasphemy because this was the prerogative of God. Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 198.

³Mk. 14:53-65 par., cf. Jn. 10:22-39. It is apparent that Jesus never really threatened to destroy the Temple, and it is quite possible that he never really made Messianic claims for himself—although he was the Messiah. (On this whole question see Section B.)

⁴Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 38: "We scarcely need to learn from a remark of the Lord later in this gospel (Mk. 9:13) that in the death of the forerunner is to be seen clearly enough a picture of the fate reserved for himself."

and kill him." (Mk. 14:1) Thus the theme of conflict runs throughout the ministry of Jesus and reaches its climax with the final plot, the trial, and the execution.

Why did the Pharisees oppose and finally destroy Jesus? It must be admitted that, whether sincere or not, whether superficially antipathetic or deeply concerned, the Pharisees opposed Jesus on religious grounds, i.e. in obedience to God's will as they held it. Doubtless there were other factors, such as jealousy of Jesus' popularity and anger at his apparent disrespect for and relentless attacks against the religious establishment. But the central issue was far more serious; it was a question of the will of God. The scribes taught and the Pharisees kept the Law, and they were committed to its preservation. Therefore, because, to their minds, Jesus was not from God, because his example and teachings went against God's revealed will, because he was usurping the true way of obedience and misleading the people, they carried on their opposition to the end. As they were taught to do in the Law, they killed him.¹

Jesus' ministry to the Pharisees was primarily one of conflict. The Synoptic materials are not entirely devoid of "friendly" encounters. Jesus healed the daughter of Jairus, a Synagogue ruler (Mk. 5:21-24, 35-43); he ate with Pharisees as well as with publicans and sinners (Lk. 7:36, 11:37, 14:1); he loved the zealous rich man who came seeking eternal life (Mk. 10:17-

¹R. T. Herford, Pharisaism: Its Aim and Methods, p. 143, quoted by Robertson, op. cit., p. 70: "Jesus was condemned and executed on a more or less political charge, for which the question of Messiahship provided a useful basis; but was really rejected, so far at all events as the Pharisees were concerned, because he undermined the authority of the Torah, and endangered the religion founded upon it." (On the accusation that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah see pp. 251-254 below.)

22); he gave his challenge to the scribe who asked about the Great Commandment (Mk. 12:28-34); he probably even had some followers among the scribes and Pharisees.¹ But certainly the encounter with the Pharisees was essentially one of conflict, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Jesus himself deliberately pursued the scribes and Pharisees. He castigated their pretense and criticized their traditions. He continually debated with them on all kinds of questions.² He told them repeatedly that they were failing to do God's will. He went straight into Jerusalem in the face of the mounting opposition, knowing full well that they might destroy him. He incurred the wrath of the priests by cleansing the temple. He steadfastly met his betrayal, trial, and crucifixion.

Why did Jesus choose this course of action; why was his ministry to the Pharisees one of conflict? The answer that has arisen throughout the course of this study lies in his understanding of the will of God. It has been pointed out time and again that the Rule of God was the central concern of Jesus' message and of his mission and that God's Rule was presented in his ministry in terms of radical demand. It was a call to repentance, faith, and radical obedience. Thus when he encountered the scribes and Pharisees Jesus was impelled to present his challenge in the form of exposure and condemnation. Because they were so "righteous" they had to be humbled, i.e. to be challenged

¹Cf. Mt. 8:19, Lk. 7:3, Jn. 3:1-15, 7:50, 8:31, 10:19-21, 12:42, 43, 19:38-40. Note that the story of Nicodemus, if historical, provides a clear example of Jesus' positive (and successful) challenge to the Pharisees.

²Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 38, points out two cases particularly in which "the Lord seems to take an almost aggressive attitude towards them." In Mk. 7:1-13 "they are severely attacked for their excessive devotion to tradition," and in Mk. 8:11-13 Jesus' refusal of their request for a sign is "extremely abrupt." We have already considered in this connection the major "outbursts" of Jesus "against" the Pharisees in Mk. 7:1-23, 12:38-40, Mt. 23:1-36, Lk. 11:37-12:1 (above, pp. 157-165).

to humble themselves. Although they were rigorously obedient to the Law, they had to be called to true obedience, i.e. to self-giving.¹ It was only because his mission was so earnest and his concern for the Pharisees so great that Jesus pursued them so relentlessly and uncompromisingly.² He thus chose the way of the cross, giving himself, even as he was "opposing" them and challenging them to give themselves, in radical obedience.

We must conclude, therefore, that at the center of the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees was an essential antithesis over the will of God. The Pharisees, who sought to be obedient through strict legalism, meticulous purity, and meritorious piety, opposed and finally destroyed Jesus. Jesus, who sought to obey and to call others to obey as he understood God's will, pursued the Pharisees and accepted his fate at their hands.³ The Pharisees

¹ Jesus certainly recognized the achievements and virtues of the Pharisees. He called them righteous and wise; he described them as the dutiful son and rightful heir, as laborers who spent all day in the vineyard; he spoke of their diligence in the law. But he also recognized that these very things were preventing the Pharisees from turning to God in repentance, faith, and true obedience, as these same materials indicate so vividly. Finally, Jesus recognized that the Pharisees were in danger of rejecting God's love and refusing God's Rule. Therefore he used no restraint in exposing and challenging them. An analogy to this situation can be seen in the extreme right-wing political groups in the U.S. today; in their vigorous and no doubt sincere defense of democracy (especially against communism) they proceed to destroy it. So also the Pharisees of Jesus' day were, they thought, wholly committed to God's will, but in reality they refused God's Rule and hindered others. They destroyed the one man who lived in perfect obedience.

² As it was suggested at the outset, it is not strictly relevant to see whether Jesus' sayings are a fair description of the Pharisees, to determine whether they applied to the majority or just the bad ones, or to consider whether his teachings rise above the best of the rabbinic teachings. Jesus deliberately caricatured and chose harsh language in order to drive home his point. He was not trying to condemn but to challenge. He did not come to change the law but to fulfill it and to call others, including the Pharisees, to fulfill it.

³ Although we may say that Jesus "accepted his fate at their hands," it is abundantly clear that this was not passive resignation but dynamic, active self-giving in the fulfillment of his mission.

refused to accept Jesus' demand; they would not repent along with the sinners, believe or trust God humbly apart from all their religious attainments, and give themselves simply in radical obedience.¹ Jesus refused to accept their pretense or their virtue, to withdraw his challenge and his offer, to avoid the ultimate demands of his understanding of obedience for them and for himself. The end and logical conclusion of the conflict was the cross.²

The concept of obedience which Jesus revealed in this conflict is the same as that revealed in his dealings with the disciples, although it is here seen from a different perspective. Once again true obedience is essentially a matter of motive. At the center of Jesus' message to the Pharisees is a challenge to radical self-emptying and self-giving. Jesus' mission, specifically in relation to his opponents, is best understood in terms of radical self-giving. Once again we may conclude that love is the motive for mission--thus Jesus taught and thus he lived and died.

¹This is not to say that the Pharisees had no repentance, faith, and obedience, for these very things were central to Judaistic religion. Nor is it to say that they had no concept of the inner and total nature of true response to God. It is simply to state the undeniable fact that the Pharisees failed to respond to Jesus' call. This failure reveals the basic failure of the Pharisees in their religion as a whole.

²On the basis of the resurrection we must conclude, of course, that the Pharisees were totally wrong and that Jesus perfectly fulfilled God's will. By raising Jesus from the dead God vindicated his mission and judged his adversaries. But this means that God's judgment on the Pharisees was love and forgiveness, for that was Jesus' mission and message to them and that was the meaning of his death.

SUMMARY:

It will be necessary to draw together the results that have accrued from this study of "The Mission and Message of Jesus (General)" before passing on to those events and sayings in the Synoptics which point more directly toward Jesus himself. The purpose of this general study has been to analyze Jesus' understanding of the will of God as he revealed it to the people, the disciples, and the Pharisees, i.e. in the three major aspects of his ministry as they are set forth in the Synoptic materials. The general study of Jesus' mission and message yields important insight into Jesus' understanding of his own mission, for in teaching others how to respond and obey he revealed how he himself sought to fulfill God's will. Although these materials and conclusions are more or less indirect with regard to Jesus himself, their combined witness is broadly based and far-reaching in significance. Indeed, because they are indirect they are less problematical with regard to Jesus. Moreover, this general study gives some indication as to how the other, more particular materials (Section B) should be approached.

The first conclusion that must be drawn from this study is that the concept of the Rule of God lies at the center of Jesus' mission and message and that this concept must be understood in terms of radical demand. Although it was assumed from the beginning that the Kingdom or Rule of God was the central concern of Jesus' ministry, this assumption has been validated throughout this study—at every point, not just where the term βασιλεία appears. It is God's Rule which Jesus proclaimed, and it is God's Rule to which he called men to respond. He presented God's

Rule as radical demand. In the public ministry Jesus proclaimed the Gospel of the Kingdom of God and brought help to the needy, but throughout this ministry, at the center, was a radical challenge. He called the people to repentance, faith, and discipleship. Jesus' teachings to the disciples were concerned primarily with the way of obedience. He taught them the radical nature of true obedience in order to challenge them to follow him in radical obedience to God. In his conflict with the Pharisees Jesus spoke of God's love and mercy and of their pride and self-righteousness in order to challenge them. He called the Pharisees, too, to respond radically. Throughout his ministry Jesus presented one basic message, the radical demand of God's Rule. He challenged all men to respond to and to receive God's Rule.

The second conclusion, which arises out of the former, is that these general materials from Jesus' ministry reveal a comprehensive theology of mission in which mission is essentially a matter of motive. Jesus sought to bring men to a radical response to God's will. His call to repentance and faith was a call to the basic reorientation of the person in response to God. His teaching on obedience was a challenge to inner and total response of the person to God; he called for self-denial, life-losing, self-humbling, and self-giving. Those who came to Jesus were told to give up everything and follow him. The disciples, who had left all things behind, were told to expect suffering and were challenged to lay down their lives. The Pharisees, who were the righteous ones of their day, were told to give up their virtue as well as their pretense, to empty themselves and respond humbly like those who had nothing. Jesus called all men to

radical obedience to God's will, for God's will (mission) is fulfilled only by self-giving (motive). This obedience also involves radical response to one's neighbor, as Jesus' whole ministry implies and as his so-called ethical teachings specify. Therefore it has been suggested that the Great Commandment sums up Jesus' mission and message as a whole and that it expresses a comprehensive theology of mission. Throughout his ministry Jesus called men to give themselves in love to God and man. His understanding of God's will was that men's lives should be given in obedience, that love is the motive for mission.

The third conclusion, which arises from the two previous ones, is that these general materials reveal the mission and motive of Jesus himself. In the radical demand of God's Rule, which was the essence of Jesus' challenge to others, and in the theology of mission, which is expressed in this challenge, Jesus revealed his understanding of God's will and thus, indirectly, the nature of his own mission. The inevitable conclusion of this study as a whole is that Jesus gave himself in love. His public ministry was marked by compassion--in his challenge as well as his deeds of mercy. Although the multitudes soon rejected his way of radical obedience, Jesus gave up his popularity in order to remain constant in his mission--for God and for them. His challenge to his followers, which involved receiving or entering God's Rule, was motivated by love for them (and for those whom they would reach with the Gospel) as well as by love for God. Although his small band of disciples followed him to Jerusalem, up to the final test, he alone went on to the cross--for God and for them. His exposure of and challenge to the Pharisees were part of the same mission

of love, for when he spoke of God's demand he included at the same time His gift. Although they continually opposed and finally destroyed him, Jesus pursued them with his challenge all the way to the end—for their own sake and for God. The basic materials of Jesus' ministry all agree that Jesus gave himself in mission, that his motive was love.

The proof of the validity of these conclusions is the way in which they provide the key to and unify Jesus' mission and message throughout the Synoptic materials. They explain why his message was Good News and at the same time a challenge, why his challenge was so complete and yet so simple, why his ministry was so open to "sinners" and yet so hard on the "righteous." Most notable is the way in which they open up an entirely new perspective for the whole section of the Synoptic materials dealing with Jesus' encounter with the Pharisees. It is now clear that Jesus' message to the people, to the disciples, and to the Pharisees was essentially the same, that his mission was to reach the scribes and Pharisees as well as the publicans and sinners with God's gift and His demand, i.e. with God's Rule. The unifying center of Jesus' ministry as a whole—at least as it is set forth in the general materials—is this concept of obedience or "mission."

The importance of these conclusions must be emphasized, for in showing that mission (radical obedience to God) is the central issue in Jesus' ministry they bring into perspective the two questions which have deliberately been avoided, viz. eschatology and Christology. It must be noted here that this study as a whole and these conclusions in particular are concerned specifically with the mission and message of Jesus from the perspective of

the actual ministry. From the perspective of the early church after the resurrection, from which perspective the Synoptic tradition was preserved and developed, it was perfectly clear that Jesus was the Messiah and that the end time had come. But according to the perspective of the ministry itself, which is the original Sitz im Leben of these materials, the basic facts of Jesus' ministry—his encounters with the people, the disciples, and the Pharisees and the culmination of these encounters in his death—can be adequately explained apart from reference to the Time or to Jesus' Person. Certainly Jesus proclaimed God's Rule as a present reality, but not because the time was unique or the Eschaton had arrived or he himself was inaugurating the New Age, rather because God's Rule is an existential reality; God's Rule always confronts man in the present moment of his existence. Certainly Jesus called men to follow him, but not because he thought he was unique, rather because he was proclaiming God's Rule. The consistent picture which has emerged is that of a man who proclaimed God's Rule and gave himself completely in obedience to God's will.

These conclusions with regard to Jesus' mission and with regard to the questions of eschatology and Christology may not be considered final until the particular materials in which Jesus is apparently revealed as Messiah and the bringer of the Eschaton have been dealt with, but they do provide a foundation for the consideration of those materials, the former materials being less problematical than the latter. Moreover, it may be pointed out here that a significant point is gained in the present interpretation with regard to the question of motive. Since Jesus proclaimed God's Rule as a present, existential reality in which God's gift and his demand are one, there is no

ambivalence with regard to his hearers. They were not to respond because the time was propitious, i.e. because God's Rule was uniquely available or because it would soon be too late or because of the threat of judgment; they were to respond because God comes to rule. Since Jesus proclaimed God's Rule apart from any consideration of his own person, there is no ambivalence with regard to himself. He was not seeking his own Kingdom or his own position as a present leader or Messiah or as a future glorious figure. Jesus simply challenged men to respond and give themselves to God's Rule, and he simply responded and gave himself to God's Rule. Moreover, since God's Rule is a present, existential reality and since His gift and His demand are one, there is no antinomy with regard to motive; God's Rule is its own reward, so that there is no compromise of the radical nature of the demand; to respond to God's Rule is to receive God's Rule, not an inward realization of or hope for future entrance into the Kingdom as a personal goal or state of bliss. Thus, according to this interpretation, the whole of life is focused in response to God's Rule and obedience to God's will (i.e. mission), and the motive for mission is unmitigated self-denial and self-giving (i.e. love).

B. THE MISSION AND MESSAGE OF JESUS (PARTICULAR):

There remain to be studied those Synoptic materials which speak more or less directly concerning Jesus himself. It is readily apparent that there are many important incidents and sayings from Jesus' ministry which are concerned primarily with Jesus himself. Consideration of these materials has been deferred until now because the difficult questions of Christology and eschatology emerge in them. The previous general study has, however, provided a foundation from which to approach these materials and a perspective from which to consider these questions. It should be noted that these materials do not form a separate strand of materials or another aspect of Jesus' ministry but the same ministry as it is set forth in more particular materials. It is important to remember, finally, that the purpose of this study is to analyze the purpose (mission) and motive of Jesus during his ministry.

In the materials to be considered here the questions of Christology and eschatology are particularly acute. It is evident, for instance, that the Gospels seek to show not just how Jesus fulfilled God's will but above all that he was the Messiah, the Son of God.¹ Almost all the materials that make up the Gospels, as they now stand, seem to bear witness to Jesus' person, not just his

¹This is brought out especially in the introductory materials to all four Gospels. The clearest statement of purpose is found at Jn. 20:31: "These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." C. F. D. Moule, "The Intentions of the Evangelists," New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: University Press, 1959), p. 166: "These Gospel traditions, accordingly, were doubtless framed within the context of Christian faith, so that no Christian writings are mere dispassionate narratives but are documents of faith, springing from such an estimate of the person of Jesus as belongs not to a sceptic but to an already convinced believer." Moule is certainly correct in arguing that the intentions behind the writing of the Gospels, viz. apologetic and witness to outsiders, and instruction and worship in the church, should not be taken as denial of their historicity. On the contrary, the underlying purpose was to "tell the story," to set forth the actual facts of Jesus' ministry and death as well as his resurrection.

mission in the strict sense. His whole life, from his birth to his death, is presented as unique and "supernatural"; the record of his ministry is full of signs and mighty works; his sayings are set forth as authoritative pronouncements. Moreover the question of Jesus' identity, particularly in connection with contemporary Messianism, must have arisen during his ministry as well as after the resurrection, and it is almost certain that Jesus was executed as "King of the Jews," i.e. as a Messianic pretender. Under the weight of all this evidence the ministry of Jesus as a whole and the individual sayings and events from it have traditionally been interpreted in terms of the "Messianic" and/or "filial"¹ consciousness of Jesus.

Recent scholarship has, however, brought into question this whole approach. Literary comparison among the Gospels reveals that the record of Jesus' ministry has been enhanced especially at those points which reveal his person.² It is now recognized that even Mark, the earliest evangelist, was, as his title indicates, bearing witness to "Jesus Christ, the Son of God," (Mk. 1:1), not writing a history or a biography.³ It has become increasingly clear that not only the

¹G. S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man (London: Nisbet & Co., 1947), takes a filial-consciousness approach over against the Messianic-consciousness approach, but he still remains in the dilemma of making Jesus' consciousness of his own person, i.e., his claims to uniqueness, the foundation of his ministry.

²This will be seen in the discussion of the materials, beginning at the baptism, where it is especially noticeable.

³R. H. Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 61: "The primary interest of our earliest evangelist is in the significance of the person of Christ." The opening title (Mk. 1:1) and the introduction as a whole (Mk. 1:1-13) are meant to provide the key to all that follows. In The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), p. 47, Lightfoot says, "Probably we shall best understand his book and his purpose, if we regard both it and the little sections by means of which it is so largely built up, as an illustration, exposition and demonstration of the Church's Gospel." But once again this insight must not lead to anti-historical conclusions. As J. M. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark (London: SCM Press, 1957), p. 12, points out, we must "recognize the basic fact that Mark finds meaning and divine action in history, and therefore intends to be recording history."

written but also the oral traditions of Jesus' ministry all the way back to the time of the resurrection itself have been preserved and developed as witness to Jesus' person.¹ This further confirms the importance of studying Jesus' ministry, even in those materials which speak about his person, in terms of his mission in the strict sense.

The difficult but necessary task is to weigh at every point in the accounts the tension between the actual historical ministry of Jesus and the witness of the early church after the resurrection. It is perfectly understandable that the Gospel writers, the early preachers, and even the Apostles themselves referred back to the actual works and words of Jesus in the light of the resurrection and found in all of them his unique person. It is also understandable that the perspective of Jesus during his actual ministry was entirely different from the perspective of the early church; he was wholly taken up in the carrying out of his mission. This is not to say that the church was wrong in calling Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God. The resurrection was ample proof that he was.² Nor is it to say that they were wrong in interpreting the materials from his ministry

¹W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 94: "There is no smallest unit of this tradition which is not instinct with Christological significance. And this is because the motive which from the start led to the preservation of historical material in the tradition was a Christological motive." To say that these oral and written traditions bear witness to Christ is not to say that they are anti- or non-historical. It is merely to affirm that they are theological as well as historical and that justice must be done to both these characteristics. It used to be argued that since Mark, the earliest Gospel, is relatively primitive it must be historical. Now we can see that the presence of development after Mark should lead us to expect the same tendency in and prior to Mark, especially in the matter of Christology.

²Although the resurrection itself lies outside the scope of this present study, the assumption taken throughout is that it was an actual historical event as well as a unique redemptive act of God. In fact the approach taken in this section lays more, not less, weight on the resurrection as historico-theological event than the traditional interpretation.

in terms of his person. Their task was, after all, to proclaim Jesus as Messiah and Lord. It is, however, to say that if we are to discover the nature and motive of Jesus' mission we must consider the Synoptic materials from the perspective of his actual ministry, not merely in terms of their present form.

There is an important theological issue involved here, especially when the question of motive is raised. If we are to study the works and words of Jesus from the perspective of the actual ministry, we must take seriously the fact that he was a man. Traditional orthodoxy, on the basis of the witness of the primitive church and the creeds of the ecumenical councils of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. has generally read the life of Jesus in terms of his unique person, and this has inevitably led to the concept of his "Messianic consciousness." But we may question whether it is possible to take seriously Jesus' humanity while maintaining that he knew he was the Son of God, whether he really suffered and humbled himself if he knew he would be vindicated personally in the end, whether he really gave himself in his obedience if he knew his kingdom was just around the corner.¹ Thus, in order to define more adequately the nature and motive of Jesus' mission, we shall challenge the traditional Messianic-consciousness approach.

The following study will, therefore, consider those Synoptic materials which speak more or less directly concerning Jesus himself with these factors in

¹ Surely there is an essential antimony in the traditional position which is summarized by this statement of W. Manson, Jesus The Messiah, p. 111: "He who is called to be the Messiah-Son of God sees the way marked out for him by the practice of the Servant, and teaches also that only through the humiliation and self-sacrifice of the Servant is the glory of the Son of Man to be attained."

mind. On the basis of the previous study of the general materials from the ministry it will find in God's Rule the central factor of Jesus' mission and message, and it will interpret God's Rule as radical demand. Because of the central critical problem of the tension between the Sitz im Leben Jesu and the setting of the early church, specifically with regard to the matter of Jesus' uniqueness and his person, it will seek to interpret the materials in terms of Jesus' mission in the strict sense. In the light of the important theological question of motive it will take as its starting point the fact that Jesus was a man. These important materials from Jesus' ministry, beginning with the story of his baptism at the hand of John and ending with the account of his death at the hands of the religious^{and} political rulers of first century Palestine, may thus be expected to reveal Jesus' mission and motive, and the results of this study may be expected to confirm and extend those derived from the previous general study.

1. The Opening of the Ministry.

Certain materials naturally group themselves around the opening of the ministry. Although present opinion as to the temporal and geographical structure of the Gospel narratives is generally far more radical than the traditional view of the past, it is hardly to be questioned that Jesus' ministry began in the context of the work of John the Baptist.¹ Closely associated with Jesus' baptism is his temptation in the wilderness. These two narratives are not only set at the outset of the ministry; they are also taken as foundations for the ministry. We shall attempt to see what they reveal concerning the nature and motive of Jesus' mission.

a. The baptism of Jesus by John is of great importance. "The fact that Jesus let himself be baptized by John belongs to the data of his life which cannot be doubted. Nor can the fact that the meeting with John was and continued to be of the highest importance for his own understanding of his mission."² The baptism may be considered as historical fact because of the problem it presented to the early church. John's mission was, to be sure, useful and meaningful to the early church, for it provided the background and starting point for Jesus' ministry. John was understood as the forerunner, Elijah, the voice crying in the wilderness and preparing the way of the Lord.³ But Jesus' submission to

¹This is affirmed by all four Gospels and also by the kerygma as it is set forth at Acts 1:22, 10:37, 13:34.

²G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960), p. 49.

³Mk. 1:2-8, Mt. 3:1-12, Lk. 3:1-17. Mark quotes Mal. 3:1 and Is. 40:3; Matthew quotes Is. 40:3; Luke quotes Is. 40:3-5. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, p. 19, makes the interesting observation that John's appearance is described, although Jesus' is not, in order to draw the parallel to Elijah (cf. 2 Kings 1:8). In History and Interpretation in the Gospels, pp. 63, 64, Lightfoot

John's baptism, a baptism for the remission of sins, was a difficult problem in the face of the church's belief in Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God.¹ A comparison of the Gospel sources reveals successive attempts to handle this problem.² Therefore we must conclude that the baptism was an historical event and that the record of this event was developed in keeping with the church's interpretation of Jesus' person.³ We are thus led to consider Jesus' encounter

states, "The baptism and preaching of John were regarded in the primitive church as the immediate prelude of what we may call the divine message or action of salvation," and argues that this is "why St. Mark connects the proclamation of the divine sonship of Jesus with the moment of his baptism by John."

¹M. Dibelius, The Message of Jesus Christ, 1939, p. 183, cited by J. W. Bowman, The Intention of Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943), p. 18: "No Christian would have invented, in Jesus' honor, a tale in which the Master himself was a recipient of John's baptism."

²Mark's account (Mk. 1:9-11) states that Jesus came from Nazareth and was baptized by John, that when he came up out of the water he saw the heavens opened and the Spirit descending upon him like a dove, and that a voice came from heaven, "Thou art my beloved Son; with Thee I am well pleased." Luke's account (Lk. 3:21, 22) makes the reference to the baptism less direct ("And when Jesus also had been baptized") and the reference to the heavens opening more direct ("the heaven was opened") and describes the descent of the Spirit as "in bodily form." Matthew's account (Mt. 3:12-17) interpolates a remonstrance on the part of John ("I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?") and a reply by Jesus ("Let it be so now; for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness") and puts the voice from heaven into the third person ("this is my beloved Son"). John's account (Jn. 1:29-34) omits all reference to the baptism itself, puts into the mouth of John the witness (of the church) to Jesus, "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world," makes John identify Jesus as the Coming One whom he had foretold, and has John experience and bear witness to the descent of the Spirit and a somewhat different message from heaven ("He on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain, this is he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit"). This development can, of course, be traced further in the Apocryphal Gospels. In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, Jesus says, "In what have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless, perhaps, what I have just said is a sin of ignorance." The Gospel of the Ebionites adds to the words from heaven, speaks of a great light and of a fire kindled in the Jordan, and makes John fall before Jesus and ask to be baptized himself.

³We may note one point in particular concerning which there is evidence elsewhere in the Gospels themselves that the theology of the Church has here glossed over—and apparently contradicted—the historical event. According to Matthew and John, Jesus was recognized by the Baptist; but it is evident from Mt. 3:7-12/Lk. 3:7-9, 16, 17, that John's Messiah differed substantially from Jesus, and it is evident from Mk. 2:18 par., Mt. 11:3/Lk. 7:19; Jn. 3:23 (cf.

with John, his baptism in particular, in terms of his mission rather than in terms of his person.

Whatever affinities John may have had with the sects and movements of his day it appears as if he was a solitary voice calling the nation to repentance. He was not a political revolutionary, although he became embroiled with the rulers and was executed by Herod Antipas as a troublemaker (Mk. 6:17-29).¹ His purpose was not to found a sect or to gain followers for an existing group, although he did in fact acquire disciples and start a movement.² He did not establish a new code or a new piety, although his own food and clothing were those of an ascetic (Mk. 1:6, Mt. 11:8/Lk. 7:25). He was not an apocalypticist, although his message was proclaimed with the urgency of impending judgment (Mt. 3:7-12/Lk. 3:7-18).³ He did not claim to be the Messiah but proclaimed the coming of the Mightier One (Mk. 1:7, 8).⁴ John's mission was prophetic; he called his

Acts 19:1-7) that John continued his work apart from Jesus. It is most likely that John did not recognize Jesus at the baptism but that he was made a witness to Jesus in the subsequent development of the tradition. Cf. Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

¹Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, xviii, 5, 2, (par. 116-119).

²Cf. Mk. 2:18, 6:29, Mt. 11:2/Lk. 7:19, Jn. 1:35, 3:25, 4:1, Acts 19:1-7.

³T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1949), pp. 40, 41, suggests that John contrasted his own baptism of water with the coming baptism of fire ("with the Holy Spirit" being the interpretation of the early church on the basis of their experience), i.e. judgment. "When the reference to the Spirit is dropped, the nature of the saying is apparent. It falls into line with the rest of John's preaching. The baptism with fire is parallel to the other references to fire and to be understood in the same way. The sense of the saying is not that John's baptism is the preliminary to something better, but it is the last chance of escaping something very much worse, namely the coming judgment." Cf. V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959), p. 157.

⁴T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 41, argues that John was referring to the Messiah (cf. Is. 9:6/Ps. Sol. 17:44) and that he was describing not a supernatural being but a man endowed with supernatural power and authority.

people to repentance and obedience. In the tradition of the prophets he looked for a visitation of God's judgment on his people, and he challenged them to turn from their sinful ways and produce the fruits of true repentance. He warned them not to count on their natural descent from Abraham, and he called them to be baptized, even as pagan proselytes¹ into the true Israel.²

Why then did Jesus come to John for baptism, and what does this event reveal concerning his mission?³ Other people who were baptized by John probably came for various reasons--under the burden of sin, in response to God's voice, with nationalistic fervor, in the hope that this was the dawning of the Messianic Age. Jesus evidently saw in John the working of God and came in response to God's call.⁴ His purpose must have been to fulfill God's will as it was revealed through

¹H. H. Rowley, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect," New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, pp. 218-229, shows that there is no real evidence to link John or his baptism with the Essenes and that his baptism has far more in common with proselyte baptism than with anything practiced by any of the sects at that time.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 41: "The preaching of John as a whole belongs to the same strain as the preaching of the greatest Old Testament prophets. Like them he has his message of doom for a sinful nation. But he goes farther. His task is not merely to proclaim the coming wrath, but also (again in the words of Amos) to prepare Israel to meet her God, to show a way of repentance and amendment whereby some at least may be delivered before it is too late. In this setting the baptism of John can perhaps be most readily understood by reference to the Jewish baptism of proselytes. As the baptism of the proselyte was part of the ceremony of dedication by which a Gentile was incorporated into Israel, so John's baptism is an act of rededication by which Israelites, who through sin have lost their right to the name, may be incorporated afresh into the true Israel." Cf. Manson's The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), p. 44, where he argues that the point of "John's procedure is that he deliberately invites the children of Abraham to submit to a rite which has been devised for the benefit of pagans."

³It should be noted that the question of Jesus' purpose in submitting to John's baptism is prior to the question of what happened at the baptism and remains whatever view is taken of the latter.

⁴Cf. T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, pp. 46, 47.

John; his motive must have been to give himself in obedience. So he entered into John's baptism "to fulfil all righteousness."¹ Note that Jesus came and submitted to John's baptism in response to God--as, indeed, all who came were called to do. He did not become a disciple of John but carried out his own mission apart from John. But Jesus never refuted John's work. On the contrary he spoke of John's greatness (Mt. 11:7-11/Lk. 7:24-28). He linked together John's mission and his own in the parable of the Children in the Market Place (Mt. 11:16/Lk. 7:31-35), indicating that they both represented the call of God. He indirectly reaffirmed John's baptism in his shrewd reply to those who questioned his own authority (Mk. 11:27-33) implying that "the decision concerning John and his baptism of repentance is also the decision concerning Jesus and his mission."² All these materials confirm that Jesus came to John in response to God's call and gave himself in obedience.

Concerning what actually happened at Jesus' baptism, the problems are manifold. It has already been pointed out that comparison of the Gospels reveals different attempts to interpret this event in terms of the church's Christology. According to the earliest account, Mk. 1:9-11, Jesus himself "saw the heavens opened and the Spirit descending upon him like a dove; and a voice came from the heaven, 'Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased.'" Even here difficult questions arise. If this phenomenon appeared

¹ Matthew's account (Mt. 3:14, 15) of John's remonstrance ("I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?") and Jesus' reply ("Let it be so now; for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness") are no doubt later interpolation, but Jesus certainly did submit to baptism in obedience or "to fulfill all righteousness." Here we see the tension between the actual historical event and the resurrection faith of the church. It is questionable whether John made such a statement or recognized Jesus at all at his baptism, but it is not questionable that Jesus came in obedience.

² Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 50.

to Jesus alone, what was its nature? When and why was it communicated to others?¹ What is the exact meaning of the words from heaven?² Since these words seem to be taken from Ps. 2:7 and/or Is. 42:1, is it not possible that they were inserted into this account as the reminiscences of Jesus' ministry were circulated along with the testimonia from the Old Testament?³

These important questions are far from being answered with any unanimity of opinion or certainty. The traditional position has been to see in Jesus' baptism a clear presentation of his calling and anointing as the unique Son of God and Messiah, but this interpretation does not deal adequately with the theological influence of the early church on the records. Radical criticism treats the baptism accounts as myth or legend but this interpretation tends to depreciate the historical importance of the event. The approach suggested by this present study is to leave open the question of what happened to Jesus at the baptism and return to the more definite conclusion which has already been reached concerning Jesus' purpose in coming to baptism.

¹If Jesus related this experience, as we have it in Mark, to others, he must have made for himself the claims it implies. This point is often completely missed. Thus R. H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 84, states: "It is the voice from heaven which proclaims him as such, not a claim of his own."

²Do they recall both Ps. 2:7 and Is. 42:1? Are they intended to indicate "the enthronement of the King" and "the ordination of the Servant"? Are they meant to be the first declaration or the confirmation of Jesus' Messianic calling?

³Certainly these Old Testament passages belonged to the testimonia of the early church. Cf. C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), pp. 31, 32, 89.

This conclusion, that Jesus came to John and submitted to baptism in order to give himself in obedience to God, should not be underrated.¹ It explains his actions here, and it corresponds perfectly with the concept of obedience to which he called others.² The question of the sinlessness of Jesus need not arise.³ In any case that question, from the perspective of the life and ministry of Jesus, can only be argued from silence, for the Synoptic materials do not speak of Jesus' sin or sinlessness.⁴ It is sufficient to realize that Jesus came in response to John's message and gave himself to God's Rule. He responded in radical obedience, in self-denial and self-giving, just as later he called others to respond and give themselves. This was the nature of Jesus' mission as it is revealed at his baptism; this was the purpose

¹As, e.g., Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 54, does. He states that the baptism is "one of the most certainly verified occurrences of [Jesus'] life," but he adds, "Tradition, however, has altogether transformed the story into a testimony to the Christ, so that we cannot gather from it what baptism meant for Jesus himself, for his decisions and for his inner development."

²See Section A above, especially the concluding Summary.

³T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 150: "The question is not whether Jesus has or has not sins to confess, but whether he is to obey the call of God which comes through the last and greatest of the prophets." Bowman, op. cit., pp. 29-35, emphasizes the linguistic argument that John's call to repentance (*μετάνοια*) must have been the same as that of the Old Testament prophets, which was a call to moral decision ($\square \cdot \mu$), not a statement of emotional attitude towards one's sins ($\square \square$); it was a matter of responding to God's call, of taking one's stand for the God of Israel. E. Würtwein, "*μετανόεω, μετάνοια*," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Bd. IV, ed. G. Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942), p. 981: "So lässt sich als Grundstruktur der prophetischen Umkehr, wie sie von Hos bis Jeremia verkündet worden ist, festhalten, dass es in ihr darum geht, sich mit seiner ganzen Existenz Jahwe zuzuwenden und ihn als Israels Gott in allen Entscheidungen unbedingt ernst zu nehmen."

⁴Only from the perspective of the resurrection is this question relevant and from this perspective we must conclude with the early church (cf. 2 Cor. 5: 21, Heb. 4:15, 1 Jn. 3:5, 1 Pet. 2:22) that Jesus lived without sin.

f/ and motive of his mission from the outset of his ministry.¹

b. The temptation of Jesus in the wilderness is closely associated with his baptism; like the former this narrative is important for the understanding of Jesus' mission; and also like the former it raises the question of Jesus' person. In Mark's Gospel the temptation of Jesus is simply stated. "The Spirit immediately drove him out into the wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days, tempted by Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him." (Mk. 1:12, 13) In Matthew and Luke, however, there is an extended, vivid account of the nature of the temptation, and this account gives very significant insight into Jesus' ministry as a whole. As with the matter of Jesus' baptism it is almost certain that the story of the temptation goes back to the ministry of Jesus, for it is difficult to imagine or explain its creation by early Christians.² If, however, the account does go back to

¹In this analysis of Jesus' baptism we have demonstrated the validity and significance of our method of study. The question of Jesus' purpose or mission is historically and theologically prior to the question of his person. With regard to his mission it is perfectly clear from the historical perspective of his actual ministry that Jesus gave himself in obedience; this is confirmed by the theological perspective of the resurrection, in which Jesus was vindicated by God as the perfect fulfillment of His will. With regard to Jesus' person it is certainly true on the basis of the resurrection that he was God's Son and Messiah (but not necessarily that he knew it all along and that this so-called "Messianic consciousness" was the basis of his ministry!); from the perspective of the actual ministry, however, it is still problematical whether Jesus was conscious of being the Messiah at his baptism. Moreover, since Jesus' mission was one of self-denial and self-giving, it may be questioned whether he would have made such claims for himself as are implied in the voice from heaven and are asserted by the Messianic-consciousness approach. (The difficulty is not that such a voice should have come from heaven so much as that Jesus, if he alone heard it, should have told others about it during his ministry.)

²It has been pointed out that this story contains symbolic language and Old Testament correspondences (the wild beasts, the angels, the 40 days), that it has catechetical value (the new believer must be ready to face temptations), and above all that it provides an important key to Jesus' ministry (he rejected worldly king-

the actual ministry of Jesus, its origin is wholly dependent on Jesus himself; since he is presented as alone in the wilderness, he must have been the one to report the experience later to others. Therefore we are faced not only with the question of what the temptation meant to Jesus but also with the question of why he told it to others.¹ The answers to both of these questions have traditionally hinged upon the "Messianic consciousness" of Jesus²; the hypercritical consider the whole thing a myth or a legend; the present analysis will pursue a third alternative which will leave open the question of Jesus' unique self-consciousness and yet reveal the purpose and motive of his mission.

The assumption that Jesus told the story of the temptation is the logical starting-point; the story must have been told first of all by Jesus, probably to his disciples. The nature of the account (Mt. 4:1-11/Lk. 4:1-13) is parabolical, and its meaning lies not so much in external, literal events as in "searching spiritual struggle."³ As with the parables we must find the original

ship and did not desire recognition as Messiah as a result of his mighty works) and serves an important function in the preface of the Gospel (as a prelude to Jesus' victory over evil, the demons, and Satan). But these observations do not necessarily speak against, much less disprove, dominical origin.

¹T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, p. 55: "We must also assume that he deemed his experience relevant to the hopes and desires of his disciples. Otherwise why should he have told it to them?"

²As in the record of Jesus' baptism it is certain that the early church understood this story in terms of the uniqueness of Jesus, and it is easy to see how the story has generally been interpreted in the same way ever since then. A simple reading of the text seems only too clearly to show that Jesus was tempted because he was conscious of his unique calling and his unique power. Similarly it seems reasonable to suppose that he would have told the story to his disciples after Caesarea Philippi in order to explain his road to the cross.

³A. M. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1950), p. 38: "The temptation story describes inward experiences, not external events. It is the story of a searching spiritual struggle—a real, not a sham fight—told in the language of parable." T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, p. 55: "We should regard it as spiritual experience of Jesus thrown into parabolic narrative form for the instruction of his disciples."

setting and define the central message in terms of the actual ministry. It is most likely that Jesus told this story to his followers in order to teach them something, not merely to relate an experience of his.¹ A glance at the three replies of Jesus to the devil in the story, in which he quotes from Deut. 8:3, 6:13, and 6:16, reveals that he was teaching them about the will of God. As he did throughout his ministry, he was here showing them the way of obedience and challenging them to follow him.

Therefore the three temptations, as they were related to the disciples, are concerned with the nature of obedience. They bring out, negatively, Jesus' understanding of God's Rule over against the popular Messianic hopes which he confronted not only among the people but also among his own disciples. The first temptation, to command the stone (Matthew: stones) to become bread, corresponds with "the current belief that the Messianic Age would be marked by a miraculous abundance of material goods."² Doubtless the disciples felt the pressure of the people's need and wanted to respond, or wanted Jesus to respond, with supernatural means. But Jesus said, "Man shall not live by bread alone."³ The second temptation (in Luke's order), to worship the devil and gain power over all the kingdoms of the world, corresponds with the popular political ambitions of contemporary Messianism. And there is evidence that the disciples

¹T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, p. 55: "The important question is not whether it is an exact record of events that happened at precise times in places that could be indicated on a map of Judah, but rather what Jesus meant to convey to his followers when he told them the story."

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 43.

³Matthew adds, "but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God."

were in fact moved by this ambition.¹ But Jesus replied, "You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve." The third temptation, to perform a spectacle at the temple, also corresponds with contemporary Messianic expectations.² Jesus was often faced with requests or demands for a sign, and no doubt the disciples also wanted to have visible proof or vindication of their cause.³ Jesus' reply here was, "You shall not tempt [test] the Lord your God." It is evident that these three temptations are essentially one and that they represent the opposite of true obedience in the teaching of Jesus. To want supernatural provision of bread is to presume on the prerogative of God⁴; to seek worldly power is the opposite of humble service; to ask God to prove his power is to disbelieve (not trust) him. The one basic temptation which these examples portray is to assert self in the place of God, even in the name of service to God, rather than to submit oneself humbly and completely to God's Rule. Jesus' response in each case was to reassert God's place as King. When

¹Cf. Mk. 8:31-33 (Peter's reply to the announcement of suffering), 10:35-45 (the request of James and John and its effect on the others), Acts 1:6 (the inquiry of the Eleven). It is quite possible that Judas finally betrayed Jesus because of his disillusionment with regard to this ambition.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 44, refers to "the Jewish tradition that the Messiah would appear on the roof of the Temple and there proclaim deliverance to the people" but dismisses it as irrelevant because it makes no mention of leaping from the roof. This tradition is certainly relevant, however, for in both the third temptation and in this tradition the point lies in the demonstrative appearance at the Temple; the leap from the roof in the third temptation is merely an addition to or a variation of the same basic idea.

³Cf. Lk. 9:54 (the request of James and John for fire from heaven to consume the inhospitable Samaritans).

⁴The context of the words in Jesus' quotation speaks of the 40 years in the wilderness as a testing in which Israel was to learn that her life was from God, not from bread (Deut. 8:1-4). In making this reference Jesus showed that to demand bread from stones is the opposite of waiting upon God for his provision.

he told this story to his disciples, he was presenting to them the challenge of God's Rule; he was teaching them the nature of true response, the way of true obedience, viz. self-denial and self-giving.

Before it can be stated finally that this is the answer to the question of why Jesus told this story to his disciples, consideration must be given to the other question of what the temptation meant to Jesus himself. As we have already suggested, the traditional interpretation of this narrative is based upon his so-called Messianic consciousness; it is usually stated that the temptations are meaningless except as derivative of Jesus' knowledge that he was himself the Messiah, Son of God. But this is not necessarily the case! To be sure the story follows the narrative of Jesus' baptism in the Synoptic Gospels,¹ but it can be argued that the order of events is not a legitimate category of judgment, at least not at this point, and that the baptism does not necessarily indicate a Messianic self-consciousness.² Moreover two of the temptations begin with the words, "If you are the Son of God," but this protasis may be taken as part of the temptation itself and the use of this title for Messiah is "curiously rare in Hebrew and Jewish literature"³; as in the story of the baptism it may reflect the theology of the church rather than the words of Jesus.⁴ Furthermore the fact that these temptations have Messianic connotations is not particularly

¹Luke inserts his genealogy between these two accounts.

²See above pp. 197-204.

³T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 43.

⁴Even W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 106, admits, with regard to the use of the term "Son of God" in the baptism and temptation narratives, "it is always possible that we have the language of the church speaking in its own terms."

significant; Jewish hopes and ambitions were generally couched in Messianic terms at the time, so it was natural that the temptations which came to Jesus and his disciples should have been presented in this form. Finally the temptations seem to imply that Jesus could have turned stones into bread, gained authority over the nations, and performed a fantastic spectacle at the Temple, but that is not necessarily so,¹ nor do these assumptions necessarily lead to the traditional conclusion that the temptations were based on and are fully intelligible only on the basis of Jesus' unique self-consciousness. On the contrary it is possible and reasonable to find the meaning of these temptations for Jesus himself, as well as for those to whom he told the story, in the concept of God's Rule and in the area of obedience or mission.

It should be affirmed, first of all, that the temptation story recounts the genuine experience of the historical Jesus. Although Jesus told the story for the benefit of the disciples, as we have already suggested, it no doubt represents his own outlook during his ministry.² This is all the more evident when we take seriously the fact that Jesus was a man, a Jew, one who responded to John's prophetic call, submitted to baptism, and gave himself for the fulfillment of God's will. As Jesus took up his ministry these temptations would naturally have presented themselves: to supply all the needs of the people

¹Certainly it is possible to be tempted by the impossible; history is full of examples of men who have sought after the unattainable. Furthermore, when it is perceived that the problem here concerns the relationship between God and man, it becomes questionable whether Jesus could have performed these miracles in response to the devil's tempting, although he could have yielded to the temptation to try, for it is impossible to use God's power against His will.

²It is not unlikely that this experience came to Jesus in a particular way during one of his periods of solitary meditation in a deserted place and that when he told the story he had in mind, or even referred to, a particular experience which occurred to him just after his baptism.

miraculously,¹ to take up the latent--and sporadically active--political power of revolution,² to produce a conclusive sign of God's power.³ These temptations arose not because Jesus thought he was unique but because he earnestly wanted God's Rule to be realized, not because he thought he had a unique calling but because he earnestly sought to bring God's Rule to men, not because he thought he had unique power but because he was so conscious of God's power. In short Jesus was tempted to force God's Rule. But this course of action is, as we have already suggested, the opposite of true faith and humble obedience, for it is the way of self-assertion. Moreover, to take this course of action would be to try to thrust God's Rule upon the people. In rejecting the way of overt power and demonstrative sign Jesus revealed his understanding of the

¹This temptation was not merely to use supernatural means to help people in their need, which is certainly legitimate and which Jesus certainly did; nor is it a matter of producing a sign, which is the third temptation; it is rather to try to bring in God's Rule by miracles as such. Therefore it is important to note, as we have done (see pp. 94, 90 above), that Jesus performed his healings and exorcisms in response to need, out of compassion, not to bring in the Kingdom forthwith, and that he evoked faith at the same time. In other words his miracles were in accord with, not contrary to, his message of God's Rule as gift and demand and his mission under God's Rule as love and challenge.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 45, 46: "The whole history of the Jewish people from 200 B.C. to A.D. 130 is solid testimony to the fact that if Jesus had wished to raise a revolt against Gentile domination, he would have found a following without difficulty." See p. 96 above.

³Jesus faced repeated demands for a sign during his ministry (Mk. 8:11-13, 15:32, Mt. 12:38-42/Lk. 11:29-32, 12:54-56, 23:8), but this temptation had a much broader application than the specific requests and demands for proof that God was with him. Throughout his ministry, in so far as he wanted men to respond to God's Rule, this temptation was relevant: Wouldn't the multitude repent and believe, wouldn't the disciples lose all their doubts and hesitations, wouldn't even the Pharisees give up their opposition, if they could but see God's power and presence openly? It should be noted, in confirmation of the fact that Jesus rejected this temptation, that he performed his mighty works in response to need, not as proof of God's power; he deliberately and explicitly avoided any use of the miracles as signs. (On the question of signs see further pp. 212-217 below.)

nature of God's Rule and the nature of true response to God's Rule: God rules by love, and true obedience to God's Rule is a matter of self-denial and self-giving.¹

Therefore we may conclude, first, that Jesus told the story of his temptation in the wilderness in order to teach the disciples the nature of true obedience and, second, that this story reveals the nature and motive of Jesus' mission during his ministry. The key to this analysis is, once again, the Rule of God, which here, as elsewhere in the Synoptic materials, must be understood as radical demand. According to this interpretation the basis of the temptation--and the foundation of Jesus' ministry as a whole--was not his consciousness of his own person but his concern for God's will, i.e. his mission. Although the story of the temptation is negative in character, it confirms the "theology of mission" which underlies the general materials from Jesus' ministry.² Jesus revealed in this narrative, as in his baptism, that his purpose was to submit to God's Rule and to do God's will and that his motive was to give himself in obedience.³

¹Note that in this narrative, which is a crucial text for the interpretation of Jesus' ministry as a whole, the central issue is motive.

²The subsequent analyses of materials from Jesus' ministry will indicate that the outlook portrayed in this narrative was not just the product of a momentary experience but a reflection of a consistent theology of mission. Since it is here set over against the way of self-assertion, it has been defined as self-denial and self-giving. Since it has here implications with regard to both God and man, it can be stated as the way of love for God and men.

³As in the treatment of the baptism narrative above we may point out that this insight into the mission of Jesus is historically and theologically prior to the question of Jesus' Messianic consciousness. With regard to mission it is evident from the perspective of the ministry itself that Jesus told the story in order to teach the nature of obedience and revealed his own outlook on the way of obedience; the resurrection confirms that his understanding of obedience was correct and that he was himself fully obedient to God's will. With regard to person it is evident on the basis of the resurrection that Jesus was Messiah, Son of God, but not necessarily that consciousness of that fact was the basis of his actual ministry and its temptations; from the perspective of the ministry itself we must again state that this "Messianic consciousness" is problematic.

2. Sayings of Jesus about himself.

Although it would be impossible to deal with all the available materials, it will be necessary to give some account of the sayings of Jesus about himself. In order to show the importance and meaning of these sayings with regard to Jesus' mission it will be necessary to challenge their traditional interpretation in terms of his person. Therefore we shall consider first some sayings which deal with the matter of signs, then some which contain titles, and finally some which simply state Jesus' mission. In dealing with all of these materials the purpose will be to discover the mission and motive of Jesus.

a. With regard to signs, it has just been suggested in the preceding discussion of the temptation narrative that Jesus rejected the use of supernatural means to demonstrate the validity of his mission and message or to prove the power and presence of God—not just to prove his Messiahship. This raises the question of Jesus' miracles and the so-called Messianic Secret. The traditional interpretation, which finds considerable support in the Synoptic materials and which corresponds with the belief of the early church, is that these miracles are proof that Jesus was the Messiah and that his injunctions to silence are proof that he knew he was the Messiah. On the other hand it has been pointed out that the injunctions to silence or secrecy are a part of the theology of the evangelists and of the traditions which have preserved the records.¹

¹Cf. W. Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901). R. H. Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), pp. 57-96, states that "St. Mark's gospel is built upon the basis of a definite doctrine," that "its foundation is that Jesus is the Messiah or Christ," and that the remarkable feature of this doctrine "is that this is a secret," which explains the lack of recognition and the rejection of Jesus as Messiah. Although recognition of the theological interest in the evangelists and of the early church does not contradict the historical basis of the records, it does raise questions about it.

Therefore we are led to consider the matter of signs anew, taking seriously the historico-theological nature of the materials.

Important insight into the question of signs is to be gained from Jesus' sayings on the matter. According to Mk. 8:11-13 the Pharisees asked for a sign from Jesus in order to test him. His reply was abrupt and unequivocal: "Why does this generation seek a sign? Truly, I say to you, no sign shall be given to this generation."¹ According to Mt. 12:38-40/Lk. 11:29, 30 Jesus spoke out even more strongly against sign-seekers, calling them "evil and adulterous."² But then he added, "No sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah." Moreover, Luke continues, "For as Jonah became a sign to the men of Nineveh, so will the Son of man be to this generation." Matthew has here, "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The further material in Mt. 12:41, 42/Lk. 11:31, 32 is also relevant. According to this saying Jesus compared the queen of the South and the men of Nineveh³ with "this generation," and his concluding words were, "Something greater than Solomon...something greater than Jonah is here."

¹Matthew's parallel (Mt. 16:1-4) adds "except the sign of Jonah," but this is probably taken over from the "Q" saying which is considered next. V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959), p. 361, suggests that Mark's shorter saying "reflects Mark's belief that the Gospel is hidden from hostile Jews," but this is an unnecessary conjecture.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1949), p. 89, points out that Luke may have dropped the word "adulterous" because its distinct meaning would be unfamiliar to Gentile readers. As it is often used in Old Testament prophecy, the term means "unfaithful to God," "apostate"—which fits in with the interpretation of these verses given here. To demand a sign or proof of God's power is to be unbelieving or untrusting or unfaithful to God.

³Matthew has probably reversed the chronological order, which is found in Luke, in order to bring together the two references to Jonah.

How are these sayings to be reconciled? We may begin with the assumption that Jesus refused, as the temptation story teaches, to present any miraculous sign as proof of his mission or message. This position is well supported by the saying in Mark; when asked for a sign Jesus simply refused to give one. The question therefore arises whether the other materials, which are found in the other basic source of the Synoptics ("Q"), contradict or modify this position. Without making an extended analysis of these materials, a simple solution may be offered. There is no reason to doubt that Jesus referred to Jonah, and it is evident (in Luke) that the point of this reference is that when Jonah preached the Gentiles of Nineveh repented. So Jesus tells his hearers, especially those who look for signs, that they will be given no sign "except the sign of Jonah." This is, in fact, not a sign at all¹ but a call to repentance.² Thus Jesus goes on to compare Jonah and the Ninevites with himself ("Son of man" meaning "I")³ and his generation—not as a claim, veiled or otherwise, but as a call to repentance. The same point is made in the final saying about the queen of the South and the men of Nineveh. Those who were far removed from God responded when they heard his voice through the wisdom of Solomon and the preaching of Jonah, but the people of Israel, the Jews, who should know God's voice, to whom the challenge of God's Rule is being presented even now,

¹Therefore there is no contradiction or compromise between this saying and the one in Mark.

²The significance of Jesus' position on signs may be stated theologically: there is no revelation without reconciliation. This position corresponds with Jesus' message in general, for he presented God's gift and demand as one, i.e. as God's Rule. God is known and his love is received by submission to his Rule. (See above pp. 172-180.)

³T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 90.

do not repent. And something greater¹ than Solomon, something greater than Jonah is here: God's Rule.²

This interpretation of Jesus' sayings on signs is important because it corresponds with his message in the general materials of his ministry (Section A). He called all men, even those who challenged him, to repentance, faith, and obedience in response to God's Rule. This interpretation is feasible because it allows for the tension between the historical Jesus of the ministry and the Christ of the church's faith. Whereas Jesus meant to give not a sign but a call to repentance, the church naturally took his words here as self-proclamation; whereas Jesus compared himself to Jonah in order to show the people their need of repentance, the church soon drew the comparison between Jesus' descent into the heart of the earth and Jonah's duration in the belly of the whale; whereas Jesus proclaimed God's Rule as something greater than Solomon or Jonah, the church must naturally have thought that he spoke about himself. Finally this interpretation is helpful in the matter of signs because it confirms the fact that Jesus refused to do any signs and also because it shows that his refusal to do signs is not necessarily based on his "Messianic consciousness." As in the story of the temptation it was Jesus' understanding

¹Ibid., pp. 91, 92: "The neuter adjective here [ἐλπίς] and in Mt. 12:6 refers not to Jesus personally, but to that which is manifested in him, the Kingdom of God." In his interpretation of these verses Manson states that Jesus' "ministry is the manifestation of the Kingdom of God," that "in him the Kingdom is self-authenticating," etc., which is certainly true on the basis of the resurrection but is problematic if it is based on the "Messianic consciousness" of Jesus. From the perspective of the actual ministry we must say rather that Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom of God as a call to repentance over against the demand for a sign. His reply to the Pharisees was, "The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed,...for behold, the kingdom of God is in the midst of you." (Lk. 17:20, 21, see p.230 below.)

²Here as elsewhere in Jesus' ministry his message was God's Rule, and God's Rule was presented as an existential encounter and a radical demand.

of God's Rule and of the nature of true response to God, not consciousness of his own uniqueness, which led him to take this position.

On the basis of these insights we may return briefly to the miracles of Jesus and the "Messianic Secret."¹ There is abundant evidence that Jesus' ministry included mighty acts of healing. This in itself bears witness to his compassion for those in need and to God's power working through him, but not necessarily to his "Messianic consciousness." There is also considerable evidence that Jesus silenced the demons and asked those whom he cured not to tell others.² When the early church recounted the mighty deeds of Jesus, knowing that he had rejected all acclamation, believing that he was the Messiah, and wishing to explain why he had not been recognized as such, naturally assumed that Jesus made these injunctions to silence during his ministry in order to conceal his Messiahship. It appears likely, however, that the basis upon which Jesus silenced the demons and the healed was not this "Messianic consciousness" but, as he revealed in his teaching on signs, his understanding of the nature of God's Rule and of true response to God's Rule.

Therefore we must conclude once again that Jesus' ministry, particularly in the matter of signs, is to be understood primarily in terms of his mission, his purpose, his obedience to God's will; therefore we can see that his motive

¹See above pp. 94-96 .

²Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels, pp. 70-74, almost rules out any historical basis for these prohibitions in his desire to explain the purpose of the evangelists—particularly Mark. It may be admitted that some references are later generalized summaries (Mk. 1:34, 3:11, 12) or stereotyped additions and that the proclamations of the demons have been affected by the church's Christology. But certainly in curing demons Jesus must have silenced them; with his opposition to signs he must have carried out healings privately and with injunctions to secrecy; in his consistent setting forth of God's Rule as a call to repentance he must have avoided rumors and publicity from his miracles.

was self-denial and self-giving; therefore we can take seriously his humanity and his humility; therefore we must continue to question the Messianic-consciousness approach to the historical Jesus.

b. The sayings of Jesus which contain titles raise some of the most difficult problems, and yet unfortunately they must be dealt with most cursorily.¹ It has been argued traditionally that these titles go back to the person (i.e. self-consciousness and self-revelation) as well as the work of Jesus. But the titles themselves must be challenged on the historical basis of the Christological interest of the early church and on the theological basis of the claims they apparently attribute to Jesus. Therefore the present analysis, following the procedure and precedence of the previous sections of this study, will seek to discover the setting of these materials in the actual ministry of Jesus by considering them in terms of Jesus' mission in the strict sense. Once again it must be reiterated that this approach does not challenge the fact that Jesus was the Messiah but the supposition that he claimed or revealed from his inner consciousness that he was the Messiah. The value of this approach is that it yields new insight into Jesus' mission and motive, which is, of course, the topic of this study.

Although only one title is found consistently in the sayings of Jesus, "Son of Man," there are others which make great claims for Jesus, and their

¹To consider all the arguments would be far beyond the scope of this study, and yet the question of titles is obviously essential to the mission and motive of Jesus. Therefore the basic arguments will be sketched, and the question of motive will be pressed home. It is this question of motive and this approach to Jesus' ministry as a whole which is offered as an important and perhaps decisive element in the debate over the titles of Jesus. Would Jesus, as a man, have made such claims for himself, outwardly or inwardly, openly or secretly, as are implied in these titles?

usage in the Synoptic materials is instructive. Of the latter we may mention, first, the term "Christ" or "Messiah." It is abundantly evident that the primitive church identified Jesus as the Messiah, so much so as to make this title into a proper name for him. This explains its occurrence in the title of Mark's Gospel (Mk. 1:1) and at Mk. 9:41.¹ Of the two strategic uses of the title, at Caesarea Philippi (Mk. 8:29) and at the trial before the Sanhedrin (Mk. 14:61), in the first instance Jesus does not accept (or reject) it, and in the second his acceptance of it is questionable.² Finally, in the one case in which Jesus himself used the term, Mk. 12:35-37,³ it is evident that he thought of Christos as a title predicable not of an earthly figure, but of one exalted to the right hand of God."⁴ Therefore we must conclude that it is quite

¹The original form of the saying in Mk. 9:41 is probably found in Mt. 10:42 where instead of "because you bear the name of Christ" we read "because he is a disciple." Cf. R. H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 110. Therefore Mk. 9:41 is one example of the insertion of a Christological title into a saying of Jesus. Probably the same thing has occurred at Mt. 23:10. Cf. G. S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man (London: Nisbet & Co., 1947), p. 126.

²These two important passages will be considered separately below, pp. 234-238, 251-254. It may be noted here, however, that these two "strategic" uses of the term are important points in the theology and structure of Mark's Gospel and that these two incidents may have provided suitable occasions for the witness of Jesus as the Christ without that witness going back to the mind of Jesus at all.

³"And as Jesus taught in the temple, he said, 'How can the scribes say that the Christ is the son of David? David himself, inspired by the Holy Spirit, declared, "The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand, till I put thy enemies under thy feet." David calls him Lord; so how is he his son?'" The authenticity of this passage has been challenged, but in its favor is the fact that it does not make any explicit connection between the titles and Jesus. If Mk. 13:21,22, which contains the title "Christ," is to be taken as a genuine saying of Jesus, it should be understood as a similar reference by him to a glorious figure other than himself.

⁴Fuller, op. cit., p. 110. Fuller states further that Jesus "does not claim the title for himself in his earthly life" but "shelves it for future reference." Similarly, Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 492, argues that "certainly a secret of Jesus concerning himself is implied." There is, however, no explicit evidence for these inferences. Rather it may be argued that in so far as Jesus spoke of an exalted one he divorced himself from that one, for his mission and message as a whole indicate that he humbled himself and sought God's glory alone.

possible that the application of the title "Christ" or "Messiah" to Jesus is based not on Jesus' self-consciousness or self-designation but on the resurrection faith of the early church; certainly the resurrection of Jesus, as the vindication of his mission under, and message of, God's Rule, would have provided a sufficient foundation for the belief and witness that Jesus was the Christ.

A similar position may be taken with regard to the title "Lord." "It was the belief of the early church that after his resurrection Jesus was exalted to the right hand of God as *κύριος* (Acts 2:36, Phil. 2:9-11). In other words his dignity as *Kyrios* dates specifically from his exaltation."¹ The widespread use of Ps. 110:1 as an Old Testament witness to Jesus as Lord is evidence of the importance of the term as a theological title.² This Christian usage may well go back to "an honorific title by which Jesus was addressed during his earthly life and which is reproduced in our gospels by the vocative *κύριε*."³ In any case we are led to conclude that "Lord," as a Christological title, represents the confession of the church and that it does not represent any claim which

¹ Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

² Cf. Mk. 12:36, 14:62, (16:19), Acts 2:34, 7:55, Rom. 8:34, 1 Cor. 15:25, Eph. 1:20, Col. 3:1, Heb. 1:3, 13, 8:1, 10:12, 13, 12:2, 1 Pet. 3:22. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), p. 35: "It seems clear, therefore, that this particular verse [Ps. 110:1] was one of the fundamental texts of the *kerygma*, underlying almost all the various developments of it, and cited independently in Mark, Acts, Paul, Hebrews, and 1 Peter."

³ Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 112. Thus at Mk. 7:28 the Syrophenician woman addressed Jesus, "Lord," "Sir," and at Mt. 7:21/Lk. 6:46 Jesus refers to his being called "Lord, Lord." The occurrences of *κύριε* and *κύριος* in the Synoptic materials are too numerous to cite, but they supply ample explanation and evidence of the development within the tradition of the application of titles to Jesus where he himself made no claims. Doubtless the early church read even the original untheological references to Jesus as *κύριος* in terms of their full-blown confession of Jesus as Lord.

Jesus made for himself.

A third title which is found in the Synoptic materials is "Son of God." It must be admitted that this term, also, has an important place in the theology of the early church, as the title of Mark's Gospel (Mk. 1:1)¹ and the use of Ps. 2:7 in the testimonia² indicate. Therefore it is not unlikely that the occurrence of the title in the Synoptic materials is at least to some extent dependent upon the church's theology rather than historical reminiscence of Jesus' ministry. It is certainly noteworthy that it always appears at moments of supreme revelation—in the accounts of the baptism (Mk. 1:11), temptation (Mt. 4:3, 6/Lk. 4:3, 9), exorcisms (Mk. 3:11, 5:7), transfiguration (Mk. 9:7), and Crucifixion (Mk. 15:39)³—and that these witnesses or confessions are made by a voice from heaven, the devil, demons, and only in one exceptional instance by a man.⁴ On the other hand there is considerable evidence that Jesus' attitude toward God was like that of a son to a father⁵ and that he emphasized the

¹Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. 120, 152, gives the arguments for the retention of υιου Θεου at Mk. 1:1 and emphasizes the importance of this title for Mark: "Beyond question this title represents the most fundamental element in Mark's Christology."

²Cf. Mk. 1:11, 9:7, Acts 13:33, Heb. 1:5, 5:5, 2 Pet. 1:17. Dodd, op. cit., p. 32: "It is fairly clear that these authors at least employ Ps. 2:7 as a testimonium to the messiahship of Jesus; that is, as documentation of one of the main themes of the kerygma. In all probability they do so without literary dependance upon one another, and we may reasonably infer a pre-canonical employment of the passage in that sense."

³The question of the High Priest, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" and Jesus' reply (Mk. 14:61, 62) will be considered separately below, pp. 251-254.

⁴In the previous discussion of Jesus' baptism it was suggested that the voice from heaven is historically problematical, especially since it coincides with popular Old Testament testimonia, and the same could be said of the transfiguration story. The use of the title in the temptation narrative and in the exorcisms has also been challenged above. The witness of the centurion may have been originally a spontaneous recognition of the greatness ("Truly this man was a Son of God!") or innocence (as in Luke: "Certainly this man was innocent!") of Jesus, although Mark no doubt regarded it "as a confession of the deity of Jesus in the full Christian sense"—Taylor, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, p. 597.

⁵Cf. Mk. 14:36, Mt. 11:25, 26/Lk. 10:21, Lk. 23:34, 46.

fatherhood of God in his teachings.¹ When these two factors are taken together, they point toward a reasonable explanation of the presence of the title Son of God in the Synoptic materials. On the basis of the resurrection the church believed that Jesus was the Son of God, and on the basis of Jesus' numerous references to God as father they assumed (wrongly) that he had been revealing his own unique sonship.² We must conclude, therefore, that the evidence that Jesus thought he was the Son of God is inconclusive. Moreover the probability that he would have made such a claim is small.³

The next title, "Servant of the Lord,"⁴ even more than the previous ones,

¹Cf. Mk. 11:25, Mt. 5:45, 48/Lk. 6:35, 36, Mt. 6:9/Lk. 11:2, Mt. 6:26/Lk. 12:24, Mt. 6:32/Lk. 12:30, Mt. 7:11/Lk. 11:13, Mt. 10:29/Lk. 12:6, Mt. 23:9, Lk. 12:32. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: University Press, 1943), pp. 89-115, gives these statistics for the use of the name "Father" for God by Jesus: "Mk.--4; Q--8 or 9; M--23 at the outside; L--6; John--107." It is evident that the fatherhood of God is theologically important to the evangelists and that its usage in John and Matthew is not to be taken as historically certain, but it is also evident that Jesus himself must have referred frequently to God as Father. It is also evident (cf. Hebrew and Jewish thought), finally, that "when Jesus spoke of God as Father he was not presenting a new and revolutionary doctrine for men's acceptance."

²Even the difficult passages, Mk. 13:32 and Mt. 11:27/Lk. 10:22, may be explained in this way. Jesus was simply referring to God as Father and himself as a Son.

³Fuller, op. cit., p. 84, states, "Jesus did not 'claim' to be the Son of God, or directly call himself such, but he did know that he stood in a unique relationship of Sonship to God." But if we take seriously the setting of the actual ministry and grant that Jesus was a man, such "knowledge" would amount to the greatest possible claim! Furthermore, if Jesus did not call himself the Son of God, what proof is there that "he did know that he stood in a unique relationship of Sonship to God"?

⁴It is evident that the early church used the concept of the Servant in its Christology, as the widespread use of testimonia from Deutero-Isaiah indicates. Dodd, op. cit., pp. 88-96, traces in detail the citations, allusions, and echoes of the later chapters of Isaiah in the New Testament and concludes that at least Is. 42:1-44, 49:1-13, 50:4-11, 52:13-53:12, 61:1-2 were definite bodies of Scripture which had wide influence on Christian thought from the earliest period. Of the Synoptic references note especially Mk. 9:12, Mt. 11:2-6/Lk. 7:19-23, Mt. 8:17, 12:17-21, Lk. 4:17-21, 22:37, where it is stated more or less explicitly that the prophecies of Isaiah are fulfilled in Jesus.

lends itself to an interpretation--in so far as the ministry itself is concerned--in terms of Jesus' purpose or mission rather than his person or self-consciousness. It has been pointed out that "Jesus never once designates himself as the Servant or speaks in his name."¹ Certainly, however, there are references or allusions, or at least similarities, to the Old Testament Servant in Jesus' sayings about his work and in his actions.² The simple explanation of this fact is that Jesus saw in humiliation, suffering, and even death the way of true obedience to God's will; it is not necessary to assume anything more, viz. that he thought he was in some unique sense the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.³

Finally, we come to the one title which is found frequently--and solely--in the sayings of Jesus: "Son of Man." Jesus' use of this term can hardly be doubted, and yet the traditional Messianic-consciousness interpretation must be challenged even here. It is evident, first of all, that some of Jesus' references to the Son of Man were not meant to refer to himself; those sayings which speak of future glory refer not to himself but to an apocalyptic figure.⁴

¹W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1944), p. 111.

²Most notable are those sayings and actions which are associated with the passion; these will be considered below, pp.238-242. Mt. 11:2-6/Lk. 7:19-23 and Lk. 4:17-21 will also be considered below, pp.227-229.

³W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 111, observes that "the spirit, the example, the obedience, and the self-renunciation of the Isaianic Servant possessed a high significance for him and exercised a profoundly formative influence on his interpretation of his work and destiny." He also notes that Jesus never refers to himself as the Servant but, even when the influence of this figure is evident, uses the term Son of man. These observations lead most naturally, however, to a conclusion which Manson does not even consider: Jesus saw in the servant passages the way of true obedience; he described his mission in similar terms; he substituted the term Son of man to avoid the title or claim of the term Servant. Thus the church inevitably (and legitimately) acclaimed Jesus as the Servant after the resurrection.

⁴Cf. Mk. 8:38, 13:26, 14:62, Mt. 24:27/Lk. 17:24, Mt. 24:37/Lk. 17:26, Mt. 24:44/Lk. 12:40. Jesus is evidently speaking of the apocalyptic Son of Man of Daniel; in none of these instances does he explicitly designate himself as such. If we begin with the fact that Jesus was a man, we must question whether he did or would make such claims for himself as he here associates with the heavenly Son of man.

It is likely, too, that some uses of the term by Jesus meant, originally, simply "I," and involved no claim at all.¹ It is certain, also, that the early church extended the use of the term as a title of self-proclamation in the sayings of Jesus.² It is almost certain, finally, that two of the important statements in which the title appears are creations of the early church.³ All that remain are those Son of Man sayings which speak of suffering.⁴ Therefore the question arises,

O. Cullman, Christology of the New Testament, trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall (London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 156, taking the traditional position, doesn't seem to be bothered by this problem: "By means of this title Jesus thus ascribes to himself the highest imaginable role in the eschatological drama."

¹Mt. 8:20/Lk. 9:58: "The Son of man has nowhere to lay his head"; Mt. 11:19/Lk. 7:34: "The Son of man came eating and drinking"; Lk. 11:30 (cf. Mt. 12:40): "As Jonah became a sign to the men of Nineveh, so will the Son of man be to this generation." (If it is not a version of the similar saying in Mk. 3:28 [which would exclude it from the Son of man sayings altogether], we should include here Mt. 12:32/Lk. 12:10: "Whoever says a word against the Son of man will be forgiven.") In these cases the underlying Aramaic bar nasha should most probably be taken simply as a periphrasis for "I." Cf. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 216-218; W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp. 116, 117; R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, revised, trans. F. V. Filson and B. Lee-Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), pp. 230-234; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament,^{vol. I} trans. K. Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1952), p. 30.

²Some examples are Lk. 6:22 (cf. Mt. 5:11), Lk. 12:8 (cf. Mt. 10:32), Mt. 16:13 (cf. Mk. 8:27), Mt. 16:28 (cf. Mk. 9:1) which insert "Son of Man" for an original "I" or "Kingdom of God" and Mt. 12:32/Lk. 12:10 (cf. Mk. 3:28) which changes the original saying to read "Son of Man." (It must be conjectured that there are other cases which we cannot detect because we cannot compare them with earlier sources.) The references in the previous category, in which "Son of Man" is a periphrasis for "I," must be included here also, for certainly after the resurrection they took on the full sense of the church's witness to Jesus as Messiah. Similarly Jesus' sayings about the future Son of Man were naturally taken as self-proclamation.

³Mk. 2:10: "The Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins"; Mk. 2:28: "The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath." W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 116, says of these passages, albeit with some reservations, "The voice of the church is to be discerned rather than the voice of Jesus. The statements are official statements about the church's Lord. They are fragments of early Christian preaching." Thus these two references, along with all the previous ones, are evidence of Christological development in the Synoptic traditions.

⁴Mk. 8:31, 9:12, 31, 10:33, 45, 14:21, 41. These sayings will be considered below, see pp. 239-242. It may be noted here, however, that, since these sayings refer to humiliation, suffering, and death, they should not be taken as evidence of

on the basis of these observations and on the basis of the pattern of the emergence of the other titles in the Synoptic materials, whether Jesus did not refuse, even with regard to the title Son of Man, to make any kind of personal claim. Should we not, even here, look solely for Jesus' mission in obedience to God's will rather than his "Messianic consciousness"?¹ It may even be argued with some cogency that when Jesus did refer to himself as "son of man" he used this term specifically to avoid all titles rather than to appropriate one from Jewish apocalyptic or coin a new one.²

We shall conclude this discussion of the titles of Jesus by restating the position to which we have been led and indicating the importance of this position for the mission and motive of Jesus. It must be emphasized, first of all, that, especially in this matter of titles, we must take seriously the theological as well as the historical nature of the materials and acknowledge the contrast between their setting in the life of the early church and their setting in the actual ministry of Jesus. The early church, which believed that God had raised

Jesus' "Messianic consciousness," which is a claim in direct contradiction of the content of the sayings. Rather, as was suggested above, Jesus saw in the way of the Old Testament Servant the way he as a servant of God should obey God's will.

¹If we leave out those which refer to future glory, we are left with two groups of Son of Man sayings, those which refer to Jesus himself ("I") and those which refer to suffering. All of these sayings, i.e. the ones which Jesus describes himself, fit in with the concept of obedience which we have found throughout his ministry, viz. self-denial and self-giving; they need not imply any claim or "Messianic consciousness."

²Once again there is abundant evidence that the church's confession of Jesus as Messiah has been read back into the accounts of his ministry, and once again there is a simple explanation of this phenomenon in the words of Jesus himself (his use of the periphrasis for "I" and his references to the apocalyptic Son of Man). The crux of the argument is the resurrection, the impact of which brought forth this faith in Jesus and this record of his life and words. Once again we are forced to conclude that Jesus did not claim to be the Messiah, the Son of Man.

Jesus from the dead and exalted him to His own right hand, applied to Jesus the highest possible titles. As early Christians passed on the traditions and wrote the Gospels, their witness to Jesus as the Christ was naturally expressed in these materials.¹ Jesus' message of the present demand of God's Rule became the message of the hidden presence of the Messiah in the person of Jesus; his filial attitude toward God became his unique Sonship; his humble service, suffering, and death became the fulfillment of the mission of the Servant; the "son of man" became the glorious "Son of Man." But Jesus himself, during his ministry, as a man who proclaimed the Rule of God and called all men to humble themselves in radical obedience, would hardly have claimed for himself a Messianic title or kingdom or inheritance.² Therefore it is both historically questionable and theologically improbable that Jesus made such claims as are implied in these titles or that his so-called Messianic consciousness lies behind them.³

Although this conclusion is negative in that it challenges the traditional

¹The previous discussion of the titles has shown ample evidence of the presence of the church's witness to Jesus where he made no self-proclamation and also of numerous points at which this witness naturally attached itself.

²Here we must come out definitely against the Messianic-consciousness approach. Apparently this point has not been considered in the wide-spread discussion on the matter, but for Jesus the man to think he was the Messiah, whether he proclaimed it openly or revealed it secretly or kept it to himself, would amount to the greatest possible personal claim any Jew could make! Similarly for Jesus to take the course of action he did, even to suffer and die, in order to attain his own kingdom and glory as the heavenly Son of Man would seem to contradict his understanding of true obedience as self-denial and self-giving!

³Again we must state that this conclusion does not in the least challenge the fact that Jesus was, himself, even during the ministry, the Messiah, the Son of God, the Servant of the Lord. The resurrection—and only the resurrection—was sufficient proof to the early church that he was, and it is sufficient proof for us today. Rather we should say that Jesus fulfilled all these concepts by his radical response to God's Rule.

interpretation of these materials, it has important positive implications. It indicates that the Synoptic materials should be read, according to their original setting in the ministry of Jesus, in terms of his mission in obedience to God's will rather than his unique person or self-consciousness. Jesus sought to bring God's Rule to men, not to be the Messiah; he chose to obey God's will as it was revealed in the Isaianic Servant, not to be the Servant; he deliberately humbled himself, suffered, and died, not as a means to his own glory but for the glory of God. In short we are dealing with a real man who lived by faith and gave himself in obedience to God; we can and must find and understand this historical Jesus.

c. There remain to be considered certain sayings of Jesus in which he explains his mission directly, but even these are not free from the problem of Jesus' person. They have all been used as evidence of Jesus' "Messianic consciousness." And yet, as they are interpreted here, they should be used to define Jesus' mission rather than his person. In this way they also explain the development of the church's Messianic-consciousness approach and confirm the position taken with regard to the "signs" and "titles" of Jesus.

The background for these sayings is found in the general materials on the mission and message of Jesus, which have already been considered.¹ In the latter Jesus' message is concerned with the Rule of God, and his mission is to challenge men to respond to God's Rule in repentance, faith, and obedience. Some sayings which were considered in this connection present, more or less directly, Jesus' description of His own mission. At Mk. 4:11, 12 Jesus describes his preaching

¹Section A above.

or teaching to the people as "the secret of the Kingdom of God"; but the hiddenness of his message was, to Jesus, the hard-heartedness of the hearers, not a "Messianic Secret" known only to himself and a few followers.¹ At Mk. 9:37 Jesus speaks of his challenge to and through his disciples as receiving "me" and thus receiving "him who sent me"; he was not, however, thinking of himself as unique but of the importance of responding to God.² At Mk. 2:17 Jesus defines his mission as a call to sinners; but he was speaking here to the righteous ones, and he was challenging them specifically to radical response.³ In Jesus' message generally and in these examples particularly it is evident that after the resurrection Jesus' words should naturally have been interpreted in terms of his unique person and his "self-revelation," but in their original setting in the ministry, i.e. in the intention of Jesus, their significance lay in the proclamation and challenge of God's Rule. With these examples in mind and against this background we shall consider some other important sayings of Jesus in which he describes his mission.⁴

We may consider, first, the narrative of John the Baptist's challenge to Jesus, Mt. 11:2-6/Lk. 7:18-23. At the center of John's preaching was his prophecy of a Coming Mighty One (Mt. 3:11/Lk. 3:16), and apparently news of Jesus' mighty

¹See pp. 87-90 above.

²See p. 100 above.

³See pp. 149-152 above.

⁴Jesus' sayings about his coming suffering will be considered in the following sub-section.

works led him to send messengers with the urgent question, "Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?" Jesus' reply was a description of his ministry "in terms reminiscent of the great promises of Isaiah."¹ He said, "Go and tell John what you hear and see"; he mentioned some of the mighty acts of God, including the preaching of good news to the poor; and he concluded, "blessed is he who takes no offense at me."

Does this incident necessarily imply the "Messianic consciousness" of Jesus? No. Of course in the context of the early church it would have been taken naturally as evidence of Jesus' personal fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, and in the traditional interpretation since then it has been understood as evidence of his "Messianic consciousness." But in its original setting in the ministry of Jesus this saying represents, most likely, Jesus' description of God's work in his ministry and no more. It is unlikely that he would have claimed to be the expected Messiah of John's prophecy,² and yet he certainly believed that God was present in his ministry. Furthermore, although he did not himself become a disciple of John and although John did not follow him, Jesus did not want John to take offense at him. So he sent back this description of what was happening.³ Although this description should not be taken as evidence of Jesus' "Messianic consciousness," it does provide an important statement of his

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 67. Cf. Is. 26:19, 29:18, 19, 35:5, 6, 61:1.

²The traditional interpretation explains Jesus' reply as a qualified yes. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 67: "Jesus thus in effect answers John's question by saying: 'Yes—but not the kind you expected.'" But this explanation does not face the basic problem of the claim it attributes to Jesus.

³Surely Jesus was saying "God is at work," not "I am doing great things."

purpose or mission. Jesus saw in these acts of mercy the nature of God's Rule, and he sought in this way to fulfill God's will.¹

Another important narrative involves the accusation against Jesus in the matter of demon possession, Mk. 3:20-27/Mt. 12:22-29/Lk. 11:14-22.² No doubt Jesus did exorcise demons, for this was the ground of the charge against him. His enemies, seeing the impact of these mighty works and wanting to challenge Jesus, accused him of acting by the power of Beelzebul. Jesus refuted this challenge with a simple syllogism; it is foolish to argue that Satan would cast out Satan. He turned the charge back on them, asking, "By whom do your sons cast [the demons] out?" He indicated that this was done by the power of God: "But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." And he told the parable of the Strong Man Despoiled.

Here again we are confronted not with evidence of Jesus' "Messianic consciousness" but his description of his ministry in terms of the Kingdom

¹Attention may be drawn here to Lk. 4:16-30 (cf. Mk. 6:1-6/Mt. 13:53-58), Jesus' preaching at Nazareth. According to this narrative Jesus read in the Synagogue Is. 61:1, 2 and declared, "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing." It is evident however by its position (at the outset of the ministry), by its contrast with the parallel Markan narrative, and by its content—that this account reflects the theology of Luke. J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Macmillan & Co., 1950), pp. 65, 66: "Luke makes the recorded fact of the sermon an opportunity of announcing the programme of the Gospel." "This is, in effect, a substitute for the Markan summary of the preaching of Jesus (Mk. 1:15) which Luke has omitted, probably because he felt that it failed to express more important aspects of the Gospel." "Its real function is to introduce the main motifs which are to recur throughout the gospel and the Acts, and this it does with great effect: the gospel to the poor is preached by Jesus in his own home and rejected. The rejection by Nazareth foreshadows the rejection by the Jewish people and the subsequent universal mission of the church."

²Although these verses represent a collection of separate sayings, they are topically related, and they can be considered together. Mark lacks the question of Jesus, "By whom do your sons cast them out?" and his statement, "But if it is by the finger of God...."

or Rule of God. To be sure the early church read this narrative as evidence of Jesus' Messiahship and reasoned that his Messiahship was the basis of his power and of his works. But in their original setting these sayings of Jesus were simply explanation and proclamation of God's power over demons. Even the saying, "If it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons...", was not meant as a claim to personal uniqueness or power, for Jesus was simply explaining his own actions. The important thing was to recognize God's Rule: "...then the kingdom of God has come upon you."¹ Similarly in the concluding parable Jesus did not speak of himself as binding Satan, but he believed that, because God rules, Satan is bound and his possessions, i.e. the demon-possessed, can be plundered, i.e. released.²

We may consider, thirdly, some sayings of Jesus about the time. According to Mark's Gospel Jesus' message was, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the Gospel." (Mk. 1:15) Jesus himself said, at one point, "The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed; ...for behold, the kingdom of God is in the midst of³ you." (Lk. 17:20, 21)

¹That this was Jesus' purpose, viz. to confront men with the challenge of God's Rule, is particularly clear in his encounter with the Pharisees, which we have considered above. In his parables and other sayings--and in this dispute over the exorcisms--Jesus tried to show his antagonists that they were opposing God, not just him; he tried to get them to submit to God's Rule, not assert themselves in opposition.

²At this point we may mention Lk. 10:18: when the seventy return from their mission, Jesus says, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven." As in the case of Lk. 4:16-30 (see above p.229) it is evident that this narrative reflects Luke's peculiar interests, notably the universal (represented by the seventy) application of the Gospel, but it is possible that this saying goes back to Jesus. If so, it means that Jesus considered Satan to be defeated, and it corresponds with the parable of the Strong Man Despoiled.

³Much linguistic and theological argument has focused on the word ἐντός, which can be translated "among" or "within," but surely the point lies not in the locus or time of the Kingdom but the present, radical demand of God's Rule which Jesus is here and throughout his ministry presenting to his hearers.

On another occasion he drew his hearers' attention to their inability "to interpret the present time." (Mt. 16:2, 3/Lk. 12:54-56) He said to his followers, "Blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear. Truly, I say to you, many prophets and righteous men longed to see what you see, and did not see it, and to hear what you hear, and did not hear it." (Mt. 13:16, 17/Lk. 10:23, 24)

These and other sayings of Jesus about the time have traditionally been used as support for his "Messianic consciousness," and recently they have become the focus of strong debates over the eschatological problem. Certainly to the early church these sayings meant the fulfillment of all things in the person of the Messiah. But when we consider these sayings in their original setting a more simple explanation arises. The point lies neither in Jesus' consciousness of himself nor in his schematization of time but in the radical, present demand of God's Rule. This, after all, was the purpose of Jesus' message and of his mission: to confront men with the existential¹ challenge of God's Rule. Therefore he called all men to repentance, faith, and obedience; he told those who responded that in this response they were "blessed"²;

¹Here and elsewhere in this study (see p. 19/ above) we use the term "existential" to characterize Jesus' eschatology over against the emphases of "realized," "inaugurated," and "futurist" eschatology, for it is more in keeping with the emphasis of Jesus on the present demand of God's Rule. Certainly Jesus referred to the time, and his sayings indicate certain views of the end time, but time itself was not of the essence of his message. He did not call for decision on the basis of the time factor, i.e. because the Kingdom is now here in some unique way or because it will soon be too late. When the time question is made central it is in danger of compromising the motives of those who are being challenged. Rather Jesus called men to present decision because God comes to rule, and the nature of true response to God is, throughout his teachings, self-denial and self-giving.

²Cf. the Beatitudes, Mt. 5:3-12/Lk. 6:20-23. These should not be construed as present or future personal rewards or realization, but as expressions of the encounter between God and men in which his gift and his demand are one (His Rule) and in which their receiving is bound up with self-giving. God's Rule is radical and existential. (See p. 125 above.)

he tried to make the Pharisees see that they, too, must submit to God's Rule, which was "in the midst of you."

Finally we may look at three sayings of Jesus in which he makes explicit statements of his purpose. At Mk. 5:17 Jesus says, "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them." At Lk. 12:49, 50 Jesus says, "I came to cast fire upon the earth; and would that it were already kindled! I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how I am constrained until it is accomplished!" And at Mt. 10:34-36/Lk. 12:51-53 Jesus says, "I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to set¹ man against his father," etc.

Here, too, it is obvious that the early church interpreted Jesus' words in terms of his person, but here again it is most likely that their original setting and significance was quite different. In stating that he came to fulfill the law and the prophets Jesus did not regard his person or even his work as unique; he simply defined his purpose, viz. to do God's will as he understood it in the law and the prophets.¹ In the second and third sayings, similarly, Jesus was not speaking of his own importance; he was merely describing the nature of his mission. In pressing home the challenge of God's Rule he must necessarily—not in spite of, but because of, his concern and compassion—cast fire on the

¹ Although it can be argued that Matthew intended his Sermon on the Mount to be a setting forth of a new law on a par with the Torah by a new Moses, Jesus Christ, Jesus himself during his ministry was simply setting forth in these materials his teaching about the law, his understanding of true obedience to God's will. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: Athlone Press, 1956), pp. 55-62, compares Mt. 5:17 and the following exposition of the law ("You have heard...but I say to you") with Rabbinic teachings and finds that the differences are more apparent than essential. The form is closely parallel, although the tone of Jesus is prophetic and of the Rabbis academic or expository. Furthermore the Hebrew underlying Jesus' statement, "I came to fulfill the law and the prophets," means "to uphold."

earth and create strife among men; in pursuing this mission he foresaw for himself not victory and glory but a baptism of suffering in which he must give himself even for those who opposed and eventually destroyed him.¹

All of these sayings of Jesus—his reply to John the Baptist, his defense in the matter of exorcisms, his words on time, and his "I came" saying²—should be understood, from the perspective of their original setting, in terms of Jesus' mission in the strict sense. And yet all of them, from the perspective of the post-resurrection church, have understandably been taken as evidence of Jesus' unique person and his "Messianic consciousness." Therefore they coincide with the material on the "signs" and the "titles" of Jesus. They provide further evidence of the Christological development of the Synoptic materials, and they give further explanation of how this development took place. The resurrection naturally led to the conclusion that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, and this belief was proclaimed throughout the accounts of Jesus' ministry. But Jesus, for his part, was a man who, claiming nothing for himself, carried out his mission with complete faith in God's Rule and gave himself in humble obedience to God's will. Jesus' sayings about himself, like his general words and works, reveal that his mission was to do God's will and that his motive was self-giving love.

¹ Here we may refer back to the earlier exposition of Jesus' encounter with the Pharisees. It was found there that even Jesus' harshest words in the midst of the conflict were spoken out of concern, in order to challenge his opponents to respond and receive God's Rule. Thus Jesus deliberately prodded the Pharisees out of their proud, self-righteous religion, causing strife, to be sure, but also giving himself for them. Similarly in the case of the rich man (Mk. 10:17-22) it was pointed out that in his love for this man Jesus offered him not just a gift but the radical demand of God's Rule.

3. The Final Crisis.

Without doubt the Synoptic materials center around the final crisis.¹ The crucifixion was not only the end but also the culmination of Jesus' ministry. This was the heart of the kerygma, the key to the Gospel, the center of the faith and theology of the early church. And here, too, we find the full and final expression of the mission and motive of Jesus. Therefore we shall consider here Caesarea Philippi and the predictions of suffering, the Last Supper and Gethsemane, the trial and the crucifixion.

a. The incident at Caesarea Philippi has traditionally been interpreted as the turning point in the ministry of Jesus, and, being followed by the predictions of suffering, it does appear to hold a particularly important place in the Synoptic Gospels. Up to this point, according to Mark, only the demons have recognized Jesus as the Son of God, but now the disciples, under the leadership of Peter, bear witness that "you are the Christ." On the basis of this recognition, it has traditionally been argued, Jesus began to reveal the way in which he, as Messiah, would fulfill his unique calling, viz. by suffering, rejection, and sacrificial death, i.e. in the form of the Servant.

¹This is especially true in the earliest Gospel, which provides the basic framework for Matthew and Luke as well. C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960), p. 49, refers to Mark as "pre-eminently a Gospel of the Passion" and notes that "rather more than half the Gospel, from the beginning of chapter 8, is dominated by the thought of the approaching Passion." R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), pp. 35, 36, indicates that "the chief theme of this Gospel may be rightly described as that of the crucified Messiah" and suggests that "even in the first half of the book this thought is never long absent from the mind of the evangelist." C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 14: "Not only the second half but the whole of the gospel is dominated by its climax."

Against this arrangement and interpretation, however, certain questions must be raised in keeping with the previous investigations into the Synoptic materials.

First of all we must ask what happened at Caesarea Philippi (Mk. 8:27-30/Mt. 16:13-20/Lk. 9:18-21).¹ According to Mark's narrative Jesus asked his followers, "Who do men say that I am?" and they replied, "John the Baptist, and others say, Elijah; and others one of the prophets." Then Jesus asked them, "But who do you say that I am?" and Peter replied, "You are the Christ." And Jesus "charged them to tell no one about him." It will not do to dismiss this story as a legend²; nor may we accept it unquestioningly as it stands. It is evident that the narrative was important to the evangelists and to the early church as witness to the Messiahship of Jesus, and it may be noted that Matthew and Luke show some enhancement in this direction.³ But on the other hand, there is a definite reserve in this witness, for in the narrative Jesus does not—at least not openly—acknowledge Peter's confession. Furthermore we again meet Jesus' command to silence. It is likely, therefore, that

¹Mt. 16:17-19 will not be dealt with in this discussion.

²V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959), pp. 374, 375, gives these arguments for the historicity (and the Petrine basis) of the narrative: "the natural reference to Caesarea Philippi, the life-like picture of Peter who speaks for the rest and remonstrates with Jesus, the fact that Jesus does not forthwith confirm the truth of his confession, but sternly rebukes him." It is not unlikely that the disciples suspected and suggested that Jesus was the Messiah, and it is almost certain that Jesus foresaw suffering (cf. Mk. 8:34-36, 9:12, 10:38, 39, Lk. 12:50). Moreover it is improbable that such a scathing rebuke of Peter ("Get behind me, Satan! For you are not on the side of God, but of men") could have been created by and gained wide acceptance in the early church.

³Luke enlarges Peter's answer to read, "The Christ of God"; Matthew enlarges Peter's reply to read, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God," and also Jesus' first question to read, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?"

we are dealing with an historical incident with theological expansion.

An explanation may readily be found along these lines. Let us start with Jesus' failure to accept or acknowledge Peter's ascription of the title "Christ," "Messiah." Note, first of all, that this corresponds with the one certain reference by Jesus to the Messiah, Mk. 12:35-37, in which he speaks not of himself but of a heavenly figure.¹ On this score alone it is unlikely that Jesus would have claimed here to be (or thought of himself as) Messiah. Note, secondly, that this refusal to accept or acknowledge the title Messiah corresponds also with Jesus' teaching and example of humility. It is unlikely that one who challenged his followers² and his opponents³ to humble themselves in response to God's Rule would assert himself with the supreme self-designation of Messiahship. Note, thirdly, that the command to secrecy did not necessarily refer to Jesus' person (his "Messianic Secret"). As in the case of the healings and exorcisms it could have been simply a deliberate rejection of rumor and the wrong kind of popular following.⁴ Note, fourthly, that much weight should not be placed on the chronology of the Gospels. Although Mark's structure indicates a major turning-point at Caesarea Philippi—from complete non-recognition of Jesus (except by the demons) to recognition by the disciples, from public ministry

¹See p. 218 above.

²See pp. 115-121 above.

³See the section, "Jesus and the Pharisees," above.

⁴See the brief discussion of the "Messianic Secret" on pp. 94-96 and the matter of signs on pp. 212-217 above. Jesus was calling men to respond to God's Rule, not to submit to himself as such, and what lies behind his injunctions to secrecy is the radical demand of God's Rule, not a Messianic Secret. If Jesus had thought of himself as Messiah, why shouldn't he have told his disciples? Why is it that we have no single instance in which he told them of his Messiahship—for it certainly would have been remembered, spread widely, and included in Mark's Gospel?

to private instruction, from works of power to teaching on suffering—it is quite possible that this scheme was not an exact reflection of the ministry itself.¹ Note, finally, that if this incident did occur not on the basis of Jesus' "Messianic consciousness" but simply as a refusal by Jesus to accept the title Messiah, the telling of the narrative in the early church would very naturally have taken on its present form. As we have suggested already in connection with the matter of signs, Jesus' commands to secrecy would, on the basis of the resurrection, almost inevitably have been taken as indications of his Messiahship, and thus they would have led to the "Messianic Secret." Therefore we are led to conclude that the story of Caesarea Philippi is an historical incident in which the question of Jesus' Messiahship was raised and a theological witness of the early church in which his Messiahship is proclaimed.² This conclusion should not be taken as negative and destructive, however, for, if we conclude, with the early church, on the basis of the resurrection, that Jesus was in fact the Messiah, we can see here (in the narrative of the Caesarea Philippi incident and in the succeeding predictions of suffering) that during his ministry Jesus was a real man, that he had no

¹Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, p. 34, notes that Matthew does not completely fall in with this scheme, for at Mt. 14:33 the disciples worship Jesus as the Son of God before Caesarea Philippi. Furthermore (by way of example) against the historicity of Mark's structure, or rather as an indication of its purposeful arrangement, Lightfoot, p. 45, suggests that Mark may have omitted other references to Jesus in Jerusalem in order to emphasize the final visit, for "this coming of the Lord to the capital is an event of supreme importance in Mark."

²Ibid., p. 118 (in the later addenda to his book), quotes with approval these words from a review by T. W. Manson: "As the sequel [to Mk. 8:27-33] shows, all that Peter does is to identify Jesus with the kind of Messiah portrayed in the 17th and 18th of the Psalms of Solomon. The kind of messianic task depicted in the Son of man sayings in Mk. 8-10 has not even crossed his mind; and when it is put to him he rejects it with horror and indignation."

thought of his own uniqueness or personal vindication or future glory, and that he humbly gave himself in radical obedience to God's will.

We must consider now the predictions of suffering. After Caesarea Philippi, according to Mark, Jesus "began to teach [his disciples] that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again." (Mk. 8:31-33) He spoke of what had happened to John the Baptist ("Elijah") and indicated that he¹ too must "suffer many things and be treated with contempt." (Mk. 9:11-13)² He said, "The Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men, and they will kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he will rise." (Mk. 9:30-32) Again he said, "Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man will be delivered to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death, and deliver him to the Gentiles; and they will mock him, and spit upon him, and scourge him, and kill him; and after three days he will rise." (Mk. 10:32-34) He declared, "For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." (Mt. 10:45)³ At the Last Supper he told

¹ Jesus is obviously referring to himself in these sayings, and on the basis of earlier discussion of the titles of Jesus we may consider "Son of man" here as a substitute for "I"—either by Jesus without any thought of a title or claim or by the church with its Christology in mind. Jesus was thinking of humiliation, not glory, of death, not life. And to introduce into the mind of Jesus at this point the thought of glory through or after humiliation is to rob his mission and motive of their fullest depth of meaning, viz. self-denial and utter self-giving.

² The historicity of this narrative is, of course, challenged, but it is not unlikely that in speaking to his disciples about the coming suffering Jesus should refer to what happened to John. The details could easily have been enhanced as in the other predictions of suffering.

³ Luke's parallel at this point (Lk. 22:27) reads, "For which is the greater, one who sits at table or one who serves? Is it not the one who sits at table? But I am among you as one who serves." Cf. Lk. 19:10: "For the Son of man came to seek and to save the lost."

his disciples, "One of you will betray me.... For the Son of man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed!" (Mk. 14: 17-21) Finally in Gethsemane he said, "The hour has come; the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners." (Mk. 14:41, 42)¹

How are these passages to be taken? It is evident that we cannot simply rule them out of serious consideration as creations of the early church; nor can we simply accept them as historical record. They are certainly of great importance for the theology of the early church and of the evangelists,² and it is generally agreed that they contain, at least in some of the details, vaticinia ex eventu.³ And yet, on the other hand, it is highly unlikely that the church—or Mark—would have invented all these sayings. Therefore we must once again sort out the most likely solution in terms of historical reminiscence plus later expansion, in terms of the tension between the original Sitz im Leben Jesu and the later setting of the early church.

We may begin with the assumption that Jesus expected and predicted for him-

¹Cf. also Mk. 14:8/Mt. 26:12, Mt. 26:2, Lk. 13:33, 17:25. These passages all reflect later development.

²Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, p. 35, points out that a crucified Messiah was "the supreme paradox of Christian faith," "a stumbling block to Jews and a folly to Gentiles" (1 Cor. 1:23), and a major concern of Mark. These prophecies answer this problem and show how Jesus was the fulfillment of Jewish and of all man's hopes. Cf. Lightfoot's History and Interpretation in the Gospels (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), pp. 66, 80.

³W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1944), pp. 112-116, 129, admits that "we have here to some extent a language formulated by the church," specifically with regard to "ex post facto features." Once we omit the "ex post facto features," however, we are open to a totally different interpretation of the sayings. If we leave out the reference to "three days, rising again, the Gentiles, being mocked and scourged and spit upon, we are led to conclude, as the above discussion will show, that Jesus expected suffering and death and no more, God's glory and no more.

self and perhaps for his followers suffering and even death. This expectation has been noted already at two points. At Mk. 10:38, 39 Jesus offered James and John, instead of positions of glory, the challenge to share his "cup" and his "baptism,"¹ and at Lk. 12:49, 50 he spoke of the strife which he was stirring up and of the "baptism" toward which he was "constrained."² Moreover violence to himself was the natural conclusion of the situation which he faced and the natural outworking of his concept of obedience.³ Certainly he was aware of the opposition, which must have mounted as time went on, and certainly he knew what to expect when in the face of this mounting opposition he went down to Jerusalem.⁴ There is no question that he taught his disciples to give themselves, including their physical lives, completely in response to God's Rule,⁵ and there can be no question that he was prepared to give himself, his life, in carrying out his mission. Finally it appears as if Jesus was profoundly influenced by the Isaianic figure of the Servant.⁶ This is not to say that he thought he was himself the

¹ See above, pp. 116-118.

² See above, p. 252.

³ T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), p. 80: "The sacrifice of the Son of man is the logical issue of his service." This is true whether we hold to the "Messianic consciousness" of Jesus or not.

⁴ Moreover there is the further tremendous factor of Jesus' prophetic insight.

⁵ In the earlier discussion of Jesus' encounter with the disciples we concluded that the essence of his teaching was self-denial and self-giving and that his challenge, e.g. at Mk. 8:34, 35, included, with increasing imminence, the possibility of physical suffering and death.

⁶ J. Jeremias (and W. Zimmerli), The Servant of God, trans. from TWNT by H. Knight, etc. (London: SCM Press, 1957), pp. 79-104, argues that Jesus thought of himself as the Servant and suggests that the evidence is limited (and absent from the logia peculiar to Matthew and Luke) because Jesus only revealed this in his "esoteric" teaching. M. D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant (London: SPCK, 1959), pp. 147-163, argues that the evidence will only admit the conclusion that Jesus

Servant or the fulfillment of these prophecies in some unique way but that he saw in the way of suffering, sacrificial service the way of true obedience to God. Therefore we are led to conclude that the predictions of suffering are only partially the product of the early church, being enhanced by its knowledge of the subsequent events and of the person of the Messiah, and that they are basically from Jesus himself, expressions of his mission and motive.

This interpretation of the incident of Caesarea Philippi and the predictions of suffering is not less but far more meaningful than the traditional interpretation¹; it reveals the depth and the extent of Jesus' self-giving as he approached the end of his ministry. He was a man who proclaimed the Rule of God and challenged all men to radical response to God's Rule; in proclaiming this message and carrying out this mission he was impelled to face the ultimate consequences for himself, complete self-denial and self-giving, in obedience to God and in response to the needs of men, even for those who reacted so violently as to threaten his life. Jesus "came not to be served but to serve,

may well have seen in Is. 53, along with the whole pattern of suffering and exaltation running throughout Jewish literature, the description of Israel's and his own sufferings and concludes that he thought of himself as the apocalyptic Son of man in Daniel. This present study leads to the conclusion that the Servant prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah must have been an important element in Jesus' ministry and death, not because he considered himself to be the Servant but because the concept of self-denial and self-giving was central to his understanding of true response to God's Rule and obedience to God's will.

¹The traditional interpretation of Jesus as the Servant is, to begin with, superficial; it suggests that, because Jesus was conscious of being the Servant foretold in Deutero-Isaiah, he proceeded to carry out in detail these prophecies. (Cf. the traditional interpretation of the triumphal entry, Mk. 11:1-10, which suggests that Jesus arranged to ride on a colt in order to fulfill the prophecy of Zech. 9:9) But this interpretation is also incongruous; it states that Jesus was taking a path of humiliation and also that he thought he was this great, unique figure, the Servant. Finally, this position is intolerable with regard to motive; it suggests that Jesus chose or accepted this suffering and humiliation as the path to glory.

and to give his life¹ as a ransom for many."² This was the motive of Jesus' mission: self-giving love.

b. Two events of the night in which Jesus was betrayed, the Last Supper and Gethsemane, are particularly important for this study because of their historical value and because of their insight into the mind of Jesus as he faced the final crisis of his ministry. Perhaps the most important words of Jesus and the best attested were delivered at the Last Supper. And his prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane is also of profound significance. These two incidents are indispensable for the understanding of Jesus' mission and motive.

We shall consider first the words of Jesus at the Last Supper. "And as they were eating, [Jesus] took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to them and said, 'Take, this is my body.' And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them,

¹ $\psi\chi\eta$. Note that this was precisely what Jesus demanded of his followers in Mk. 8:35. (See p. /// above.)

² Mk. 10:45 presents a thorny critical problem, particularly because it apparently conveys a well developed theology of atonement and because its parallel in Luke apparently provides a simple non-theological alternative. We cannot hope to solve this problem here except to suggest that the saying is placed in a new light when taken, from the perspective of the ministry, as a statement of Jesus' purpose or mission without any claim for his person: Jesus came to serve and to give his life for others. Thus Mark's saying really goes no further than the other sayings in the same context, for Jesus had just spoken to James and John about his "cup" and "baptism," and Jesus' purpose for himself goes no further than his challenge to his disciples at this point and elsewhere. Luke's saying, on the other hand, should not be taken as wholly different, for it is found in the context of the Last Supper, at which Jesus again spoke of his death. In both cases we must conclude that Jesus came to serve and give his life for others. On the background for this concept of service, which is found not only in Is. 53 and elsewhere in the Old Testament but also in the writings of late Judaism specifically in the form of redemptive, substitutionary martyr-suffering, cf. C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. D. Higgins (Manchester: University Press, 1959), pp. 1-18.

'This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many.'" (Mk. 14: 22-25/Mt. 26:26-29, Lk. 22:15-20,¹ 1 Cor. 11:23-25) These words held a unique place in the faith and liturgy of the church from the beginning, and their dominical authorship is beyond question. Yet their significance--and to some extent their form--was transformed when they were transplanted from their original setting to their hallowed place in the fellowship and worship of the early church, i.e. after and because of the resurrection. We must consider in this light what Jesus actually said and what he intended when he spoke of his body and blood.

Comparison of Mark's account with the other sources, evaluation of the liturgical element, and a certain amount of conjecture help us to arrive with some certainty at the actual words of Jesus.² Matthew very closely parallels Mark; Luke evidently follows another source; and Paul, whose account is the earliest written source, is passing on what he himself received.³ The intro-

¹We must accept the longer version of Luke's account on the basis of the (decisive) textual evidence (all the Greek MSS except D). J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 2nd ed., trans. A. Ehrhardt (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 91: "To regard the shorter text as original would mean accepting the greatest improbability, for it would involve assuming that an identical addition had been made to the Lucan text in every MS with the exception of D a b d c ff² i l ^{our} sin." Jeremias, pp. 103-106, suggests that the shortened form of Luke was deliberately introduced by a western copyist early in the second century in order "to keep the Eucharist from profanation."

²The material in the next two paragraphs is based on the work of Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 106-135, although the conclusion arrived at is very different. 5/

³1 Cor. 11:23a: "For I received of the Lord what I also delivered to you." (Cf. the same formula at 1 Cor. 15:3, where Paul refers to the kerygma.) Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 129: Paul's preface to the account "says nothing other than that the chain of tradition goes back unbroken to the words of Jesus himself."

ductory words before the actual sayings of Jesus over the bread and the wine in both cases strongly reflect liturgical usage¹; this element explains the stylization of the narratives but also suggests the careful preservation of the institution from earliest times.² The common words in the saying over the bread are "This is my body," to which we may add the opening injunction "Take."³ The common words in the saying over the cup are "This is my blood of the covenant," to which we may add "which is poured out for many" and perhaps omit "of the covenant."⁴ We thus arrive at what must be substantially the words

¹Ibid., pp. 106-112, suggests the following evidence of liturgical usage in the introduction to the words over the bread: Paul's use of the title, "the Lord Jesus," his addition of "on the night when he was betrayed," and his three verbs (like a rubric) describing the rite (ἐὐχαριστεῖν is a "Graecising" of εὐλοχεῖν); Mark's "and as they were eating," which is a "resumptive insertion" following Mk. 14:18, his four verbs describing the rite (the three of Paul plus ἔδωκεν); Matthew's insertion of "Jesus" and "the disciples," his emphasis on the breaking of the bread. In the other introduction Jeremias notes: in Paul and Luke ὡσαύτως καὶ, "which reads like a short liturgical rubric," and the definite article before "cup"; in Mark and Matthew the detailed description and its similarity to the introduction before the bread. Strict historicity may demand the removal of these aspects from the accounts, and yet it is hardly to be questioned as a matter of history that Jesus "on the night when he was betrayed," "as they were eating," "took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to" "the disciples" and that "in the same manner also" he took "the cup" (i.e. the one which he blessed and gave to them), "and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it."

²Ibid., p. 69, notes that all the sources revert--and had to revert--at this point to a liturgical formula, "the wording of which had been fixed long before and had become common property through its use in the cult." When we are thus forced back beyond even Paul, we must admit "its independent existence and its great antiquity."

³Ibid., pp. 109, 110, makes these observations: "Take" in Mark and Matthew may be retained, because it is not really omitted in Luke (Lk. 22:17), but "eat" in Matthew is a (natural) liturgical addition; "for you" in Paul is secondary, for it cannot be translated back into Aramaic, and it may have developed from the word over the wine; this latter explains Luke's "which is given for you"; The command to repeat the rite is probably secondary "because its insertion is more easily explained than its omission."

⁴Ibid., pp. 112-114: Matthew's command to drink is a (typical) emendation from Mark's narrative introduction; Matthew's ἄλλο, made necessary by and laying stress on his command, reflects liturgical development; "this" (cup) and "new"

which Jesus himself uttered: "Take; this is my body. This is my blood which is poured out for many."

What then did Jesus mean by his words and actions at the Last Supper? Certain background observations may be noted to begin with. First, the idea that Jesus should willingly give his life in service to God and for others is not only acceptable but central to his concept of obedience.¹ Second, Jesus' words at the Supper follow a whole series of sayings and events in his ministry in which he foresaw and accepted a coming baptism of suffering.² Third, whatever its exact date the Last Supper took place in the context of the Feast of the Passover.³ Next certain observations may be noted with regard to the Supper itself. First, the terms "body" and "blood" refer to "the two component parts of the body, especially of a sacrificial victim, which are separated when it is

(covenant) in Paul and Luke are explanatory; the command to repeat the rite is again secondary. The important words, "which is poured out for many," can be found in all four sources: it is present in Mark, Matthew (with the addition "for the forgiveness of sins"), and Luke ("for you"), and Paul's account has it ("for you") in the saying over the bread, where ἐκχύνηνόμενον had to be omitted even though it left an awkward construction; "for many," a Semitism, is to be preferred over "for you," a reflection of liturgical usage. On the exclusion of "of the covenant" Jeremias, pp. 133-135, points out that this expression is difficult in Greek and impossible in Aramaic and that in late Judaism "the blood of the covenant" meant "the blood of circumcision"; he suggests that it may be "an early exegetical gloss, which (with the help of Ex. 24:8 and Jer. 31:31-34) explains Jesus' atoning death as the covenant sacrifice to inaugurate the eschatological order of redemption."

¹This entire study of the mission and message of Jesus leads to this conclusion.

²See pp. 238-242 above.

³According to the Synoptists the Last Supper was a Passover meal (Mk. 14:12-16 par., Lk. 22:15), but according to the Gospel of John it took place on the day of preparation (Jn. 18:28, 19:14). Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 177-183, gives an extended list of those who do and those who do not hold that the Supper was a Passover meal--being himself the leading exponent of the former view.

killed"; they belong to the language of sacrifice and, in view of the expression, "which is poured out," must be taken as such.¹ Second, the broken bread, and the red wine are a double parable of the death of a victim.² Third, if this was a Passover, Jesus may well have compared himself with the paschal lamb in the Passover devotions; at least--and this applies even if it was the previous night--the correspondence would have been self-evident.³ Fourth, that Jesus should speak of dying "for others" is only to be expected; "every death has atoning power," and "an innocent death offered to God has power to atone vicariously for others."⁴ At this point certain possible inferences may be mentioned. First, it has been suggested that Jesus indicated the eschatological fulfillment of the Passover sacrifice by himself. Second, the similarity of his words with Is. 53 has been taken as evidence that he thought he was the Servant.⁵

¹Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 144. V. Taylor, Jesus and his Sacrifice (London: Macmillan & Co., 1955), p. 74: "Whatever explanation of the death of Jesus we may give today, there can be no doubt at all that Jesus himself understood its meaning in terms of sacrifice."

²Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 145, 146.

³Taylor, Jesus and his Sacrifice, pp. 181, 183, states that, even if the Supper was not the Passover meal, "Paschal associations dominated the mind of Jesus."

⁴Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 151, 152. Jeremias gives evidence for numerous means of atonement in the thought of Jesus' contemporaries of which the most pertinent is the vicarious suffering of the righteous and of the martyrs; he concludes "it is unthinkable for Jesus not to have thought about the atoning effect of his death." Cf. 2 Macc. 7:37, 38, 4 Macc. 6:27-29, 17:22, 18:4.

⁵With Mk. 14:24: "which is poured out for many" cf. Is. 53:12: "because he poured out his soul to death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." Certainly the early church made this connection; Matthew adds to the words over the wine "for the forgiveness of sins," and Luke makes Jesus say, "For I tell you that the scripture must be fulfilled in me, 'and he was reckoned with transgressors'; for what is written about me has its fulfillment." (Lk. 22:37)

Third, it has been suggested that in offering to his disciples the bread ("my body") and the wine ("my blood") Jesus was giving them "a share in the redemptive power of his death."¹

The conclusion which arises from the perspective of this present study is that at the Last Supper Jesus told his disciples, in the language of sacrifice and with direct allusion to the Passover, that he was about to give his life in obedience to God's will and "for many." The above observations demand this conclusion. They do not, however, demand the conclusion that Jesus thought of his mission or of himself as unique, as the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, as the eschatological realization of the Kingdom, and, because these suppositions involve such claims on the part of Jesus, we may reject them. Rather, as Jesus came to the end of his ministry, he described the completion of his mission--his public ministry, his teaching to the disciples, and his challenge to the Pharisees--in the words over the bread and wine at the Last Supper. To the disciples, i.e. to those who had responded to his call and accepted his challenge, he explained that his body would be broken and his blood poured out--like the sacrifice of the paschal lamb. And he was giving his life not only for them but also for many,² even for those who took it from him.³ Thus

¹Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 159, 174. Jeremias and others strongly believe these last three points, which fit in with the "Messianic-consciousness" approach. If, however, we challenge that approach in general, we are led toward an important, meaningful, alternative conclusion in these particular materials, in which Jesus' words and actions are determined not by his conception of the uniqueness of the time or of his person but by his understanding of the radical demand of God's Rule.

²Cf. Mk. 10:45. It is hardly possible--although it is frequently done--to argue that the term "many" included, in the mind of Jesus, all the Gentiles. Since--as we have argued--Jesus was not conscious of his own uniqueness, this possibility would not have occurred to him; nevertheless he was giving himself for all those whom he did know. Moreover, in the two outstanding cases in which Jesus refers explicitly to the extent of his mission, Mt. 10:5, 6 and Mt. 15:24, he excludes the Gentiles.

³The earlier study of "Jesus and the Pharisees" indicated that Jesus' message was definitely directed toward the Pharisees, who led the opposition, that his

in the midst of the final crisis of his ministry Jesus provided this, the greatest insight into his mission and motive; he gave himself completely, even his very life, his body and his blood. Self-giving love—for God and for men—was the motive of Jesus' mission.¹

At this point we may consider briefly Jesus' prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane. After the Last Supper, on the same night, Jesus and his disciples went to the Mount of Olives to a place called Gethsemane. We read that Jesus was "greatly distressed and troubled. And he said to them, 'My soul is very sorrowful, even to death; remain here and watch.' And going a little farther, he fell on the ground and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said, 'Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee; remove this cup from me; yet not what I will, but what thou wilt.'" (Mk. 14:33-36) This narrative contains certain historical and theological problems: e.g. did the sleepy disciples overhear Jesus' prayer; why did Jesus ask for the "cup" to be removed? But these difficulties only confirm its authenticity: it is unlikely that the early church would have created this negative description of

mission to them was the same as his mission to the poor and the outcast, and that his motive was concern and compassion, and that his death was the logical conclusion of his mission and motive specifically with regard to the Pharisees.

¹Some reference must be made to the statement of Jesus that he would not drink again of the fruit of the vine "until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." (Mk. 14:25; Matthew's parallel adds "with you"; Luke says "until the kingdom of God comes.") Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. 543, 547, says this "eschatological saying" is "loosely attached" to the narrative of the Last Supper. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 165-172, emphasizes its character as an oath. Both Taylor (cf. also Jesus and his Sacrifice, pp. 138-144) and Jeremias hold to the traditional interpretation that Jesus here demonstrates his expectation of a coming Messianic Banquet with himself as Messiah. If, however, we remove the presupposition of Jesus' "Messianic consciousness," we see in these words simply a vow of dedication to his mission in obedience to God's will and in response to God's Rule—plus the influence of the eschatology of the early church.

the disciples or this unusual picture of Jesus.¹ Therefore we are given here another important insight into the mind of Jesus at the crucial climax of his ministry.

Nothing is more natural than that Jesus should go apart for prayer at this time. That he should be "greatly distressed and troubled," "sorrowful, even to death," is also understandable. Not only was there the mounting threat of personal danger--for this he was prepared and willing; but there was also the depressing knowledge that one of his own disciples had betrayed him,² that they all failed to comprehend the meaning of true obedience and the challenge of the present hour,³ that the people and their leaders, notably the Pharisees, had largely rejected his ministry. Thus Jesus agonized in the Garden, believing that in rejecting him men were rejecting the challenge of God's Rule and that in rejecting God's Rule they were excluding themselves from His love.⁴ He prayed

¹Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 557: "Both in the descriptive element and in the words of Jesus, we receive the impression of standing very close to the original facts, by implications which carry us far beyond the record itself." Cranfield, op. cit., p. 430: "It is inconceivable that the early church would ever have created such a picture of the Lord it worshiped or an episode so discreditable to its leading apostles." B. H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937), p. 267, notes that this picture of Jesus stands out in striking contrast with his "complete calm" throughout the ministry, both before this and in the succeeding arrest, trial, and execution; "this tradition of a period of anguish and inner struggle before he was able to accept the impending tragedy as the will of God can scarcely be due to anything other than a recollection by certain of the disciples to this effect."

²Mk. 14:10, 11, 17-21.

³It was suggested earlier (pp. 135-138) that Jesus' teachings to his disciples included specifically the challenge to lay down their lives and that they should have gone with him all the way to the cross. As the final hour approached, however, Jesus saw that they would all fall away (Mk. 14:26-31).

⁴Here again we must refer back to the earlier analysis of Jesus' encounter with "the Pharisees," in which we concluded that Jesus' deliberate pursuit of his opponents led him to the cross and that he thus endured his rejection, suffering, and death for their sakes as well as for the people and the disciples.

that this bitter cup might be removed from him—not in pity for his own fate but in deep concern and compassion for others, for his followers, for the people, and for his opponents.¹ Finally, and above all, he prayed, "not what I will, but what thou wilt."² He approached the end of his ministry, as he had begun at the baptism, in humble submission to God's Rule, in willing obedience to His will. The essential nature or motive of Jesus' mission was, as his prayer at Gethsemane reveals so vividly, self-denial and self-giving.

c. We come finally to the trial and crucifixion of Jesus. As we have already seen in the predictions of suffering, in the words over the bread and wine at the Last Supper, and in the prayer at Gethsemane, Jesus willingly met the final crisis of his ministry, even suffering and death. Two points of particular importance arise in connection with the trial and the crucifixion. First, there is the matter of the question of the High Priest and the charge of the Sanhedrin that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah. Second, there is the

¹It is frequently pointed out that this cup cannot refer only to Jesus' personal misfortune, for this would make a very poor comparison with the brave and even triumphant sacrifice of many martyrs. It is suggested, alternatively, that Jesus was facing the awesome burden of the sin and estrangement of humanity which he took upon himself vicariously, but this interpretation, also, would infer that Jesus was thinking of himself. The combined witness of the passion materials leads to the conclusion that Jesus was not agonizing for himself but for others: In his prophecy of the betrayal Jesus had only pity ("woe") for the one concerned; at the Last Supper he revealed his intention to give his life "for many"; his prophecy of the disciples' defection and of Peter's denial indicates his concern for them; in the Gethsemane narrative he is concerned lest the disciples enter into temptation; at the trials he makes no complaint, self-defense, or counter-accusation; on the road to Golgotha he turns back the pity of the "daughters of Jerusalem" upon themselves; and so he finally gives up his life for others.

²As Jesus taught his disciples to pray (Mt. 6:10: "thy will be done") he prays here in the agony of this hour ("what thou wilt"). As he challenged them to the reversal of their wills and the giving of their lives in obedience (Mk. 8:34, 35), he here submits himself to God's will and offers himself in obedience. In these crucial words of Jesus we see again that his mission was essentially a matter of obedience to God's will, that his mission or obedience was essentially a matter of motive (the inner and total orientation of the person), and that his motive was, in the profound sense set forth by this thesis, love (self-denial and self-giving).

problem of the cry of dereliction from the cross. At these points we again face the basic question of the "Messianic consciousness" of Jesus; here again we gain profound insight into Jesus' mission and motive.

According to Mark's account of the trial, when Jesus had been taken captive and "all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes" had been assembled, the High Priest asked Jesus, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" Jesus replied, "I am; and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." This reply evoked the judgment "blasphemy" and the condemnation "deserving death." (Mk. 14:53-64) According to this account Jesus made a clear and unequivocal claim to Messiahship. The traditional interpretation is that Jesus did admit that he was the Messiah, though perhaps not so directly as Mark indicates, for, it is said, he certainly was conscious of being the Messiah.¹ A number of factors lead toward a different conclusion, however.

There are, on the one hand, certain historical difficulties. First, the reports of what happened at the trial must have been second-hand, for none of the disciples were present.² Second, questions have been raised concerning the procedure of the trial, which suggest that this was not, as Mark seems to imply,

¹It may be noted here that the Messianic-consciousness approach is forced to say that Jesus did not deny this charge, if it was raised, for, if he was "conscious" of being the Messiah, he could hardly have lied to the contrary.

²Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. 563, 564: "No disciple was present at the trial, and for his information the Evangelist was dependent upon hearsay." This does not necessarily discredit the account, but it does indicate the necessity for caution. It may also be noted at this point, with Taylor, that some of the details of the narrative "recall" (and reflect?) the ³Islamic prophecies of the suffering Servant.

a full court session of the Sanhedrin.¹ Third, even if Jesus was accused of claiming to be the Messiah, this does not prove that he did make this claim.² Fourth, elements in the accounts of the trial in all three Gospels seem to suggest that Jesus did not—at least not openly—profess Messiahship.³ Fifth, it was only natural for the early church to assume that Jesus confessed his Messiahship at this point, especially if they thought this charge had been made

¹G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960), pp. 163, 164, points out that "capital crimes should be tried during daytime only, certainly not during festival times, and not be dealt with at a sitting of one day only" and that "there is not one single instance of a person's ever being accused of blasphemy and sentenced to death by the Jewish authorities because he claimed to be the Messiah." There is also the further point that the Sanhedrin had power to condemn and execute men on religious grounds (cf. Acts 6:8-7:60), although this point is questioned by Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 646. It is not unlikely that the Jewish authorities quickly and informally gathered and determined a charge against Jesus and then forced Pilate to pass sentence and execute him. (Cf. the account in the Gospel of John, which has no meeting of the Sanhedrin.)

²In general the charges against Jesus are not to be trusted. He was accused of forgiving sins, but he simply told people their sins were forgiven (by God). He was accused of breaking the Sabbath, but he merely did good deeds on the Sabbath. He was accused of casting out demons by the prince of demons, but he really did it by the power of God. In particular the charges at the trial are not to be trusted. Jesus was accused of threatening to destroy the temple, but this was not true (cf. Mk. 15:29, Jn. 2:19, Acts 6:14). Thus the charge that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah may well have been a deliberate twisting of Jesus' words or a fabrication of false witnesses; certainly it was well suited, because of its political connotations, to bring about Jesus' condemnation by the Roman authorities; and to get Pilate to do the "dirty work" was admirably suited to the position of the Jewish authorities in the face of possible adverse popular reaction.

³With regard to the accounts of the trial before the priests, Mark and Matthew indicate that Jesus "was silent and made no answer" to the charge that he said he would destroy the temple; in both Matthew and Luke and in a variant reading of Mark Jesus gives a circuitous answer to the question whether he is the Messiah (Matthew: "You have said so"; Luke: "If I tell you, you will not believe; and if I ask you, you will not answer," "You say that I am"; Mark's variant: "You say that I am"). With regard to the trial before Pilate, in all three accounts Jesus gives an indirect answer to the charge, "Are you the King of the Jews?" (he replies, "You have said so") and then remains silent. In the Gospel of John there is no account of the former trial, as we have noted, and before Pilate Jesus makes an indirect reply.

against him, but also since they knew he had been crucified as "King of the Jews" and believed, on the basis of the resurrection, that he was the Messiah. Sixth, there are definite indications that Mark wanted to show that Jesus' claim to Messiahship was the cause of his condemnation¹ and that this open declaration provided for him the climax of his Gospel of the Crucified Messiah.² To begin with, in the one place where Jesus spoke about the Messiah (Mk. 12:35-37), as we have noted already, he referred not to himself but to an exalted heavenly figure. Moreover, since Jesus refused to admit or claim that he was the Messiah before his disciples (Mk. 8:27-30), as we have suggested, it is unlikely that he would do so at this time, for here more than anywhere else he would have been misunderstood.³ Finally, we must again raise the important

¹Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, p. 47: "St. Mark seeks to prove that the Lord met his death, not because his thought or his life ran counter to the law, but because he claimed to be the Messiah"; "he shows that the Lord is innocent of any just charge, except the charge--immediately before the end--that he claimed to be Messiah." Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels, pp. 150, 151, also draws attention to the growing tendency in the early church, evident in the accounts, to exonerate Pilate and to lay full blame upon the Jews for the death of Jesus.

²That which is recognized only by supernatural powers in Mk. 1:1-8:26 and by the disciples in Mk. 8:27-14:61, that which has been kept secret throughout the ministry, is now openly declared to the Jewish nation by Jesus himself, viz. his Messiahship.

³Can we say that Jesus deliberately aided the Jewish leaders in what would be the greatest possible crime, the murder of their Messiah? This is what the traditional interpretation comes to, for it must have been obvious to Jesus that the question of the High Priest was not merely a question but a charge on which to condemn him. Nor is this difficulty eased if we take the secondary reading of Mark (and Matthew and Luke) with Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 568: "The reply is affirmative, but it registers a difference of interpretation: 'the word is yours,' 'Yes, if you like'; as if the speaker has his own ideas about Messiahship." For any kind of an affirmative would be sufficient for the priests to carry their charge. (Whether this charge was a legitimate one is a different matter.) If because of his "Messianic consciousness" Jesus could not have denied the charge, at least he could have remained silent.

question whether Jesus as a man would have made, or even thought, such an exalted claim for himself, for here and elsewhere he speaks of the glorious, apocalyptic Son of Man at the right hand of God.

Therefore we are led to conclude once again that the claim that Jesus was the Messiah rests not on his self-designation or his "Messianic consciousness" but on the fact of the resurrection and on the development of the tradition in the early church. Jesus himself may well have been asked at his trial if he were the Messiah; he may well have been charged with this claim¹; he may well have spoken here as elsewhere of the glorious Son of Man.² But he probably did not make any such claims for himself; he simply faced his accusers and his judges in humble obedience, in the fulfillment of his mission, to the glory of God. And so he was sent to the cross.

In the accounts of the crucifixion itself we have several different "words" of Jesus, but the one which is the most difficult and the most profound is the cry of dereliction. "And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, 'Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?' which means, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'" And then he died. (Mk. 15:34-37/Mt. 27:46-50) Although this saying comes from

¹Branscomb, *op. cit.*, p. 279: "Since [Jesus' claim to Messiahship] was evidently the basis of the charge which was pressed before Pilate, it is more than likely that the question was addressed to Jesus during the examination."

²It may be suggested that in reply to the question about the Messiah Jesus referred to the apocalyptic Son of Man, certainly not in order to exalt himself beyond their judgment, not to confront them with his "real" identity, not merely to give his conception of the Messiah, but in order again to challenge his opponents to seek God's glory, to respond to God's Rule. This could have been twisted by his accusers into a charge of blasphemy, as though Jesus had made himself God, and it would naturally have been taken by the early church as an admission or confession by Jesus of his own exalted nature.

the favorite "Passion Psalm" of the early church (Ps. 22:1),¹ its authenticity here need not be denied, for it must have presented a tremendous enigma to their faith and theology.² Its historicity is further supported by the reminiscence of its being misunderstood by some of the bystanders, as though Jesus had called for Elijah. It is likely, therefore, that these words were uttered by Jesus himself,³ and, since they were spoken at this final hour, they are of profound significance for our understanding of Jesus' mission and passion.⁴

¹It has frequently been pointed out that elements from Ps. 22, 31, and 69 and Is. 53 (etc.) have affected the passion narratives at various points, but this is only to be expected, for before the gospels were written the best authorities which could be used in telling the story were these Old Testament scriptures. Cf. Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels, p. 156; C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), pp. 92-98.

²Thus Luke omits this saying, although he has an alternative final saying, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit." (Lk. 23:46) Similarly John's two final sayings are "I thirst" and "It is finished." (Jn. 19:28, 30) Following this line of reasoning, Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 594, argues for "the great improbability that tradition would have assigned to Jesus such a saying except under the warrant of the best testimony."

³The question whether Jesus actually uttered these words involves numerous and extended arguments, and perhaps it cannot be decided conclusively on the basis of the available evidence. It is argued that the early church would never put these particular words into the mouth of Jesus (rather than others in the same Psalm, for instance), but against this it is suggested that they were intended to be taken in connection with the following verses or the Psalm as a whole (which speaks not of despair as such but of the righteous in adversity). It is argued that the reference to the misunderstanding of the bystanders is evidence of historicity, but against this it is suggested that this reference reflects rather Mark's emphasis on the saying (a device used in Jn. 3:3-15, 4:10-15, 32-34, 11:23-27, 14:4-7). It is argued that the saying's omission from or transformation in Luke and John shows its offensiveness and thus its historical priority, but against this it is suggested that the offensiveness of the saying to some traditions or periods does not prove that it was always taken as such. On the whole, however, it seems more likely that Jesus did utter these words than that the early church would have incorporated them, as has been suggested, in order to interpret the last cry of Jesus (Mk. 15:37).

⁴If Jesus did in fact quote these words from Ps. 22, this must have been an important factor behind the use of this and other Old Testament writings as testimonia in the early church.

What then did Jesus mean by this so-called "cry of dereliction"? On the one hand this saying expresses his agony and desolation.¹ Not only was he a man forsaken by his close friends and disciples, rejected by his people and condemned by the religious and political authorities of the land. Not only was he suffering terrible pain and approaching death. But, as one who had proclaimed God's Rule and had sought to challenge men to respond to God's Rule and was even then giving his life for the fulfillment of God's Rule, he could see only utter rejection of himself and of God and complete failure of his mission and of God's will. And so he cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" But on the other hand and at the same time this saying expresses the faith and obedience of Jesus.² Although all men had apparently rejected him and his message, Jesus still called out from his agony in trust in God. Although his life's work and even his death seemed useless and fruitless, he yet committed himself in his agony to God. And so he cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

¹Taylor, Jesus and his Sacrifice, pp. 159-163, rightly objects to the traditional interpretation as too "theological," for Jesus must have experienced real desolation, not just "vicarious," "substitutionary" endurance of man's lost condition. He explains this desolation as due to "preoccupation by Jesus with the fact and burden of sin," but this too is theologically removed from the mind of Jesus. He was not thinking of himself as lost vicariously or individually, but of his mission as unrealized and his people unreached.

²Ibid., p. 160, rightly rejects the view which sees in this cry "an utterance of unbroken trust" based on Ps. 22 as a whole, for this interpretation glosses over the fact that the saying itself is obviously an expression of desolation. Moreover, there is no proof that Jesus had the whole Psalm in mind. G. Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, trans. P. P. Levertoff (London: SPCK, 1929), p. 207, speaks of the saying both as a "cry of anxiety" and as "an act of obedience," but also suggests that Jesus saw himself as the fulfillment of the prophecies of Ps. 22 and Is. 53. Once again we must ask whether Jesus thought of himself as unique and, if he thought of himself as the Servant-Messiah—Son of Man, whether he could have known real desolation, real agony, real self-denial.

Therefore here at the end of the life and ministry of Jesus we have a final, pregnant expression of his mission and motive, for we see here that he gave himself completely and selflessly--without any hope of personal vindication, without any assurance of accomplishment, but in utter desolation, in complete agony--on the cross. In these last words of Jesus before he died we have a final, profound glimpse into the mind of the one man whose life was given in obedience, in love for God and men, for he gave not only his body to be broken and his blood to be poured out but himself.

SUMMARY:

This summary will serve to draw together the results of this study of "The Mission and Message of Jesus (Particular)" and to confirm the results of the previous study of the general materials from Jesus' ministry. The purpose throughout Part II has been to analyze the mission and motive of Jesus during his ministry as they are discernible in the Synoptic materials. Because the resurrection has revealed that Jesus' life was the perfect fulfillment of God's will, the full meaning of man's mission in obedience to God's will is to be found in his ministry. This study thus provides the content for a "biblical" theology of mission.

Although this study has taken the position of faith in the uniqueness of Jesus, it has arrived at a position definitely removed from traditional interpretations of Jesus' ministry. We have been led to this position for historical reasons, i.e. in the light of a critical evaluation of the sources, and for theological reasons, i.e. in the light of theological necessity. Although the resurrection, which is the decisive point joining the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, demands that we acclaim Jesus as the Servant-Messiah, the Son of Man-Son of God, the Kyrios Christos, it does not demand that we affirm Jesus' self-understanding in these terms during his ministry. Although the Synoptic accounts indicate that Jesus was acknowledged as Messiah and indeed that he confessed his Messiahship and Sonship, it is at these points that we must be most critical. Thus the present study has taken as its starting point the fact that Jesus was a man who proclaimed and responded to God's Rule; it has posed the question of motive, i.e. whether Jesus would have made such claims for himself as are implied in these materials as they

stand; and it has come out against the traditional Messianic-consciousness interpretation, yet with an important positive understanding of Jesus' mission.

It may be useful to reiterate some of the points which have been considered, noting that a definite pattern emerges. At the beginning of his ministry Jesus was baptized by John; since John had proclaimed a Coming Mighty One, the early church later applied this proclamation directly to Jesus, making John a witness to his Messiahship; the meaning of the baptism to Jesus, however, was his response to God's call and self-commitment to God's will. In the baptism and transfiguration stories a voice from heaven declares that Jesus is the Son of God; since these words correspond to important testimonia of the early church, it is quite possible that they were inserted into the accounts; therefore we dare not depend upon them for insight into the mind of Jesus. According to the temptation narrative Jesus was tempted by the devil to use power for his own ends; the church naturally interpreted these temptations on the basis of Jesus' Messiahship; to Jesus, however, they indicated the nature of God's Rule and the nature of true response to God's Rule. In the matter of signs Jesus likened himself to Jonah; the early church drew the parallel between Jonah in the belly of the whale and Jesus in the belly of the earth; but Jesus had intended not to give a sign but to call men to repentance as Jonah had done. Again in the matter of signs Jesus silenced the demons and exhorted the cured not to speak out; the early church naturally interpreted this in terms of the "Messianic Secret"; but Jesus had simply tried to avoid rumors and the wrong kind of response to his ministry. In the matter of titles Jesus spoke of himself as bar nasha; the church read this in terms of the apocalyptic Son of Man; but Jesus had used this expression as a periphrasis for "I" without any claim for

himself. On other occasions Jesus spoke of the apocalyptic Son of Man; the church made the natural connection of these words with Jesus himself; but Jesus would hardly have made such an assertion during his ministry. At Caesarea Philippi and at the trial before the high priest⁸ Jesus was accused of claiming to be the Messiah; the early church naturally assumed he did make this claim; but again Jesus probably did not think of himself this way. What is involved in the final judgment of the question of Jesus' "Messianic consciousness" is not just the possibility that the early church could have made this kind of development in the tradition but the evidence that they did so at numerous points, not just the certainty that they did so at these points but the natural expectation that they should have done so in general and specifically at the points which are unverifiable, not just the probability of each case but the cumulative evidence of this whole pattern.

The results of this analysis, though negative with regard to the traditional interpretation, are in fact positive. Nothing significant has been lost, for the witness to Jesus as the Son of God has merely been shifted back to the resurrection, where its real weight must lie in any case. Moreover none of the materials have been dismissed summarily; they have been accepted as the witness of the church, which is certainly true to their nature and which must to some degree be taken over against their true historicity. What then is the net result of this investigation; what was the outlook of Jesus during his ministry? We must conclude that he was a man who carried out his mission in response to God's Rule and gave himself in obedience to God's will.

Thus Jesus came to John's baptism in repentance, i.e. in self-commitment. He had such faith in God's power that he healed the sick and exorcised the

demons; yet he refused the temptation to assert himself in the work of his ministry with signs or acts of power or popular aggrandizement. Taking no titles and making no claims for himself, he humbly pursued his mission in utter obedience to God—with the prospect and then the fact of suffering, in the face of rejection by his people, condemnation by their leaders, and desertion by his own intimate followers, finally in the agony and desolation of the cross. This is the picture which has emerged from this study; it is the picture of a man who gave himself completely in love for God and men.

These particular materials from Jesus' ministry thus agree with the general materials which were considered previously, and these conclusions confirm and complement those reached in Section A. As Jesus proclaimed the message of God's Rule, he himself lived in response to God's Rule. As he challenged others to a radical response of repentance, faith, and obedience, so he himself responded in repentance, faith, and obedience. His ministry was not based on a conception of the uniqueness of the time or of his own uniqueness; far from looking beyond present humiliation and suffering to future vindication and glory he gave himself completely in mission, even in the worst imaginable extremities. In this picture of the Jesus of history we see what is the essence of obedience; here love is the motive for mission and the essential nature of mission is found in the concept of love. This is the content for a "biblical" theology of mission.

CONCLUSION--Love as a Motive for Mission

"Love is the motive for mission, and the essential nature of mission is to be found in the biblical concept of love." This thesis, which was set forth at the beginning of this study, must now be declared proved--at least with regard to the mission of Israel and the mission of Jesus. What remains is to point out the implications of this thesis. It was stated in the introduction that the purpose underlying this study was to probe into the biblical understanding of mission, particularly the motive-force of mission, in order to provide a basis for the church's theology of mission. It was also noted in the introduction that this is a study in biblical theology and that biblical theology does not replace, but provides the groundwork for, dogmatics. Therefore, although we may not here construct a theology of mission upon the results of this study, we may well suggest the implications of this study in biblical theology for a "biblical" theology of mission.

Part I: "The Mission of Israel" reveals that a comprehensive theology of mission is found in the prophetic materials of the Old Testament and that these materials provide the structure for a theology of mission, specifically in terms of love as a motive for mission. According to the central concepts of the message of the prophets, viz. election, covenant, and service, Israel was created to be the people of God, which means not that she was to have special privilege but that she was called to special service. Therefore Israel's whole life was bound up with her mission. But God's call to Israel was based on his love for her. Therefore the nature of her true service was also love. Here it is evident that God's people are called to participate in his purpose and love, that the whole life of God's people is involved in this mission, and that love is the motive for mission.

Part II: "The Mission of Jesus" reveals that the central issue of Jesus' ministry was response to God's Rule and obedience to God's will and that Jesus' ministry, considered in the light of the resurrection but from the perspective of the historical Jesus, provides the content for a theology of mission, specifically in terms of love as a motive for mission. Jesus presented the message of God's Rule as a radical demand, in which he called men to repentance, faith, and obedience. He taught that the nature of true obedience is self-denial and self-giving. The record of his ministry in the Synoptic materials, as they have been interpreted here, indicates that Jesus thus gave himself in love for God and men, and the resurrection reveals that he thus perfectly fulfilled the will of God. Here it is evident that love is the motive for mission and that the essential nature of mission is found in this concept of love.

On the basis of these two studies in the biblical theology of mission we may point out certain directives for the church's theology of mission, for it is evident that the church, as the people of God, has inherited Israel's mission and that the church's mission as the body of Christ is based on Jesus' mission. First we may indicate the essential structure—the fact, extent, and dynamic—of the mission. It is evident from this study that the raison d'être of God's people is the purpose and love of God; they are called not to privilege but to service. The extent of their involvement in mission is the extent of their involvement in God's love and purpose; their whole life as God's people, i.e. their whole life, is to be expressed in mission. The dynamic of this mission is found in the logic of their involvement in God's love and purpose; as God has given himself to them in his love and purpose, so they are

to respond by giving themselves in the extension of that love and purpose in the world. Second we may indicate the basic content--the nature and essence--of the mission. The distinctive nature of obedience to God's will is the inner and total response of the person. To be sure there is a message to be proclaimed, but this message is concerned with reconciliation between God and men in purpose and love. Therefore the essence of mission is the complete giving of the self in love for God and men, whereby this reconciliation is both proclaimed and realized.

What emerges from these directives is a total view of the church in which the church is mission. The chief problem at this point is that to speak in such generalities may in fact obliterate the far-reaching, vital insight which has been gained and thereby blunt the sharp point of the stimulating demand which that insight implies. This insight and demand may perhaps be stated more strikingly in these terms: the Great Commission and the Great Commandment are one! It was suggested in the introduction that this study is concerned particularly with the relationship between the concept of mission and the concept of love. It has been stated throughout this study that love is the motive, the essential nature of mission. When these two concepts are so related they both take on new meaning and importance. The church's mission is not just to tell the Gospel; it is to give itself--and thus its message--in love to the world. The church's command to love God and neighbor is not just a duty, that which is right; it is an all-encompassing demand in which the whole church becomes a ministry of reconciliation in the world. Thus the Great Commission and the Great Commandment are really one. Thus the church is mission in the vital sense that its entire life, corporately and individually, in every aspect

and activity, participates in God's purpose and love in the world.

In this analysis of the missionary nature of the church we have an important criterion by which we may evaluate the church's life as a whole; more particularly we find here a deep and wide indictment of the church's failure—past and present. We must challenge, for example, the church's history, ever since the Constantinian Revolution, as an institution of wealth and power, and we must point out that even today throughout the historic branches of the church not one member in a hundred gives of his time or his possessions, his position or his prestige to the point of sacrifice. We must challenge the devolution of the church's mission, almost universally in practice and also often even in theory, upon that small fraction of its total membership, the clergy, and we must point out that even today this terrible fault is little less evident in protestant than in Roman Catholic contexts. We must challenge the church's obsession, from the early centuries, with sin and salvation, particularly the traditional egocentric form of these doctrines and derivative practices in which the chief end of man, either openly or more subtly, is his own salvation, and we must question here particularly the missionary expression of this mentality, especially in the sects and in mass evangelism today, which offers to "outsiders" the gift of salvation in a way which almost inevitably suggests self-realization or self-betterment. We must challenge every self-understanding of the church which is essentially or even apparently self-centered, for the meaning of the church's existence and its witness to the world are essentially self-denial and self-giving, i.e. love.

How then, positively, may we apply this analysis of the missionary

nature of the church to the church's life? An important step in the right direction has been made among those who have participated in the discussion of the ecumenical mission of the church and have brought about the integration of the movement toward Christian unity and the movement toward world mission, i.e. the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council. It is generally agreed at this level that, idealistically, the church itself is mission, that the church is a reconciled and a reconciling community. But the practical outworking of this understanding, in which the whole life of the church is poured out in dynamic mission, is hardly evident at all. It is—and this too is understood by those who are a part of the ecumenical discussion—at the level where the church really lives in its widest extent that this theology of mission must take hold and this practical effect be achieved. Members of Christian communities, in cities and villages, in industry, agriculture, professions, and government, in every social environment throughout the globe, must comprehend that their life, their whole life, is a missionary vocation and that the essential nature of that vocation is love. They must not only understand but act, denying themselves and giving themselves in love for God and men. When this occurs—and it has happened and will happen throughout history in various degrees and in various forms—the purpose and love of God are expressed in and through his people, but the potential dynamic force of this mission can only be imagined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

- Abrahams, I. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 2nd series. Cambridge: University Press, 1924.
- Albright, W. F. The Biblical Period. Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania.
- Albright, W. F. From the Stone Age to Christianity. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1957.
- Andersen, W. "Further toward a Theology of Mission," The Theology of the Christian Mission. Ed. G. H. Anderson. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- Andersen, W. Towards a Theology of Mission. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Arndt, W. F., and Gingrich, F. W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Trans. and adapted from W. Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, 4th ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- Barr, J. The Semantics of Biblical Language. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Background of Mark 10:45," New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson. Ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959.
- Black, M. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Blackman, E. C. "The Task of Exegesis," The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.
- Bornkamm, G. Jesus of Nazareth. Trans. I. and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960.
- Bowman, J. W. The Intention of Jesus. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943.
- Bowman, J. W. "The Term Gospel and its Cognates in the Palestinian Syriac," New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson. Ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959.
- Branscomb, B. H. The Gospel of Mark. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937.
- Branscomb, B. H. Jesus and the Law of Moses. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.
- Bright, J. A History of Israel. London: SCM Press, 1960.

- Bright, J. The Kingdom of God. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- Brown, F., Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C. A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.
- Bultmann, R. Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Bultmann, R. Theology of the New Testament, vol. I. Trans. K. Grobel. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- Bultmann, R., and Weiser, A. Faith. Trans. from TWNT by D. M. Barton. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1961.
- Cadoux, C. J. The Historic Mission of Jesus. London: Lutterworth Press, 1941.
- Carrington, P. According to Mark. Cambridge: University Press, 1960.
- Cobham, J. O. "Covenant," A Theological Wordbook of the Bible. Ed. A. Richardson. New York: Macmillan Co., 1957.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. The Gospel According to Saint Mark. Cambridge: University Press, 1959.
- Creed, J. M. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan & Co., 1950.
- Cullmann, O. The Christology of the New Testament. Trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Dalman, G. Jesus-Jeshua. Trans. P. P. Levertoff. London: SPCK, 1929.
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: Athlone Press, 1956.
- Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904.
- Dibelius, M. From Tradition to Gospel. Trans. B. Lee-Woelf. London: Nicholson & Watson, 1934.
- Dillistone, F. W. "The Dispensation of the Spirit," Missions under the Cross. Ed. N. Goodall. London: Edinburgh House Press, 1953.
- Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet & Co., 1952.
- Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960.

- Dodd, C. H. "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative," Expository Times, xliii (June, 1932).
- Dodd, C. H. The Parables of the Kingdom, revised. Glasgow: William Collins Sons, 1961.
- Duncan, G. S. Jesus, Son of Man. London: Nisbet & Co., 1947.
- Ebeling, G. "The Meaning of 'Biblical Theology,'" Journal of Theological Studies, vi (1955).
- Eichrodt, W. Theology of the Old Testament, vol. I. Trans. J. A. Baker. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- Farrer, A. M. "On Dispensing with Q," Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Flew, R. N. Jesus and his Church, 2nd ed. London: Epworth Press, 1938.
- Fuller, R. H. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Gehman, H. S. "The Covenant—The Old Testament Foundation of the Church," Theology Today, vii, 1.
- Goodall, N., ed. Missions under the Cross. London: Edinburgh House Press, 1953.
- Gottwald, N. K. A Light to the Nations. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- Grant, F. C. Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1960.
- Grayston, K. "Unclean," A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Ed. A. Richardson. New York: Macmillan Co., 1957.
- Hogg, W. R. New Day Dawning. New York: World Horizons, 1957.
- Hooker, M. D. Jesus and the Servant. London: SPCK, 1959.
- Hunter, A. M. Introducing New Testament Theology. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- Hunter, A. M. The Work and Words of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1950.
- Jacob, E. Theology of the Old Testament. Trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958.
- Jeremias, J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 2nd ed. Trans. A. Ehrhardt. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

- Jeremias, J. The Parables of Jesus. Trans. S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1958.
- Jeremias, J., and Zimmerli, W. The Servant of God. Trans. from TWNT by H. Knight, etc. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- Johnson, A. R. The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, 2nd ed. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961.
- Kittel, R. The Religion of the People of Israel. Trans. R. C. Micklem. London: George Allen & Urwin Ltd., 1925.
- Kraemer, H. A Theology of the Laity. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958.
- Kuist, H. T. Jeremiah. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Lightfoot, R. H. The Gospel Message of St. Mark. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Lightfoot, R. H. History and Interpretation in the Gospels. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- Mackay, J. A. "The Great Commission and the Church Today," Missions under the Cross. Ed. N. Goodall. London: Edinburgh House Press, 1953.
- Manson, T. W. Ethics and the Gospel. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Manson, T. W. "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Manson, T. W. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1949.
- Manson, T. W. The Servant-Messiah. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- Manson, T. W. The Teaching of Jesus. Cambridge: University Press, 1943.
- Manson, W. Christ's View of the Kingdom of God. London: James Clarke & Co., 1918.
- Manson, W. The Gospel of Luke. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.
- Manson, W. Jesus the Messiah. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1944.
- McIntyre, J. On the Love of God. London: Collins, 1962.
- Moffatt, J. Love in the New Testament. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929.

- Montefiore, C. G. Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings. London: Macmillan & Co., 1930.
- Moore, G. F. Judaism, vol. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Moule, C. F. D. "The Intentions of the Evangelists," New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson. Ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959.
- Mowinkel, S. The Old Testament as Word of God. Trans. R. B. Bjornard. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1960.
- Newbigin, L. One Body, One Gospel, One World. London: IMC, 1959.
- Nineham, D. E. "The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel--an Examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis," Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Nygren, A. Agape and Eros. Trans. P. S. Watson. London: SPCK, 1953.
- Otto, R. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, revised. Trans. F. V. Filson and B. Lee-Woolf. London: Lutterworth Press, 1943.
- Peake, A. S. The Religion of Israel. London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1908.
- e/ Pederson, J. Israel; Its Life and Culture, Vol. I-II. Trans. A. Møller. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.
- Phythian-Adams, W. J. The Call of Israel. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Quell, G., and Stauffer, E. Love. Trans. from TWNT by J. R. Coates. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. St. Mark. London: Methuen & Co., 1925.
- Richardson, A. "Gospel," "Kingdom of God," "Repent," A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Ed. A. Richardson. New York: Macmillan Co., 1957.
- Richardson, A. The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Robertson, A. T. The Pharisees and Jesus. London: Duckworth & Co., 1920.
- Robinson, J. M. A New Quest of the Historical Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Robinson, J. M. The Problem of History in Mark. London: SCM Press, 1957.

- Rowley, H. H. "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect," New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson. Ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959.
- Rowley, H. H. The Biblical Doctrine of Election. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.
- Rowley, H. H. The Missionary Message of the Old Testament. London: Carey Press, 1944.
- Rowley, H. H. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.
- Rowley, H. H. The Unity of the Bible. London: Carey Press, 1953.
- Schmidt, K. L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Berlin: Trowitsch & Sohn, 1919.
- Schmidt, K. L., et al. Basileia. Trans. from TWNT by H. P. Kingdon. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.
- Schweizer, E. Lordship and Discipleship. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Scott, R. B. Y. The Relevance of the Prophets. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947.
- Snaith, N. H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London: Epworth Press, 1944.
- Snaith, N. H. Mercy and Sacrifice; A Study of the Book of Hosea. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Spicq, C. Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament; analyse des Textes, 3 vols. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958, 1959.
- Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Bd. I. München: Oskar Beck, 1922.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels; A Study of Origins. London: Macmillan & Co., 1924.
- Taylor, F. J. "Life," A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Ed. A. Richardson. New York: Macmillan Co., 1957.
- Taylor, V. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan & Co., 1959.
- Taylor, V. Jesus and his Sacrifice. London: Macmillan & Co., 1955.
- Taylor, V. The Life and Ministry of Jesus. London: Macmillan & Co., 1954.

- Taylor, V. The Person of Christ. London: Macmillan & Co., 1958.
- Torrance, T. F. The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948.
- Torrance, T. F. Royal Priesthood. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1955.
- Van Den Berg, J. Constrained by Jesus' Love. Kampen: J. E. Kok, 1956.
- von Rad, G. Studies in Deuteronomy. Trans. D. Stalker. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Vriezen, T. C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Trans. S. Neuwen. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Warnack, V. Agape; Die Liebe als Grundmotiv der neutestamentlichen Theologie. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1951.
- Weiss, B. Biblical Theology of the New Testament, vol. I, 3rd revised ed. Trans. D. Eaton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882.
- Wrede, W. Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901.
- Wright, G. E. The Challenge of Israel's Faith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.
- Wright, G. E. God Who Acts; Biblical Theology as Recital. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Wurtwein, E. "μετανοέω, μετάνοια," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Bd. IV. Ed. G. Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942.
- Young, R. Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible, 8th ed. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.